

# THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*.

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke*.

---

Nos. 4, 5 & 6      JULY—SEPTEMBER, 1944      Vol. XXXIV

---

## SIGNS OF THE TIMES

THE PRIMATE, THE CONVOCATIONS, THE DIVORCED.

Dr. Temple in the *Canterbury Diocesan Gazette and Notes* (July, 1944) reminds all concerned that the four Houses of Convocation have agreed that the Church Marriage Service 'should never be used where one of the partners to a proposed marriage has a partner to a former marriage and still living,' and the Primate adds:

'By that rule I regard myself as bound, and must give direction accordingly with regard to any such case which may be referred to me.'

The Primate's justification for this policy is summed up by His Grace as follows:

No doubt there are very hard cases, and I wish the Church had courts that could issue decrees of spiritual nullity in some instances, especially when the dissolved marriage was that of a minor. But we have no means of granting nullity on grounds acceptable to the Church, and the State grants it only on narrowly-limited grounds. It is quite impossible for the Church to discriminate between the applications which are made; the technically guilty partner is often no more guilty than the other, and so forth. If our Lord's principle and standard is to be upheld, the direction given by the Convocations is quite necessary (cited from the *Guardian*, June 30th, 1944).

The Primate's pronouncement directs public attention to the very serious moral situation in matters matrimonial in our English life to-day; but we venture with all respect to question whether the Church's decision enunciated by the Primate really goes to the heart of the matter and offers a solution which will alleviate the situation or only serve to aggravate it.

The situation is a very complicated one and no just and merciful solution of the problems it has created can be secured by rigid rules and negative policies. Let it be granted, however, at the outset that those Churchmen who agree with the Primate's

pronouncement and those Churchmen who do not agree with it are united in their ideal of Christian Marriage and in their desire to promote it in our national life. That ideal, put briefly, is that Christian Marriage ought to be monogamous and life-long.

The second issue on which both Anglo-Catholics and Liberals are united is that the Christian Church should do all in its power to promote this ideal of marriage. The difference between these two schools of Churchmen arises over *the best methods* to be used in realizing this ideal in our national life. It seems to us (we view this matter as Liberal Churchmen and subject to correction) that Anglo-Catholics rely too much on Church discipline based on a literal and inflexible interpretation of Christ's recorded teaching on marriage and divorce, and that this fails to do justice to the spirit of the Gospel and to the actual practice of the New Testament Church.

Christ's ideal of marriage was monogamous and life-long. It is preserved in its primary form in Mark's Gospel (x, 1-12) followed by St. Luke (xvi, 18) and St. Paul (I *Cor.* vii, 10, 11). The Apostolic Church, however, recognized that in practice exceptions must be allowed to the ideal of monogamous life-long marriage in certain cases. In Matthew's Gospel (xix, 9; v, 32), the exception is that of sexual infidelity on the part of one of the partners. In such cases divorce is permitted and the marriage contract between both parties is terminated. St. Paul, in the Corinthian Church, admitted another class of exception. It is technically known as 'the Indulgence of St. Paul' (I *Cor.* vii, 15) and concerned the case of the marriage of a Christian to a Pagan. Such a marriage might be terminated by the desertion of the Christian partner by the Pagan partner. Should this occur, the Christian partner was permitted to marry again, but this time only to a Christian.

In view of these Apostolic precedents recorded in the New Testament, it would seem that the Christian Church to-day is entitled to claim authority to admit further exceptions should these be demanded to secure the Christian ideal of marriage in modern life. If the Church refuses to make further exceptions demanded by cruel and intolerable matrimonial conditions, she revolts the sense of justice and compassion in human nature, and far from strengthening, weakens the ideal of Christian marriage. The Church may even be sinning against the Holy Spirit, if the Rabbinical saying be true :

'With whomsoever the spirit of man is pleased the Spirit of God is pleased, but with whomsoever the spirit of man is displeased the Spirit of God is displeased.'

What are the causes which have led the four Houses of Convocation to forbid the marriage of divorced persons by the Church

under all circumstances, except where one of the divorced partners has died? Briefly, the reasons appear to be as follows :

(1) The Church is alarmed by the great and growing increase in the number of divorces. This increase is deplorable, but the decision of the four Houses of Convocation will do nothing of itself to check this increase, which is a feature of the national desertion of Christian principles and practice. It is modern Christian Education of both clergy and laity which is the real remedy ; and this is so contrary to the growing spirit of reaction in Church circles that there seems little hope of securing it.

(2) The second reason for the resolutions of the four Houses of Convocation is that these bodies consist entirely of clergymen. The clergy for the most part lead exemplary and sheltered domestic lives ; but this renders them less sensitive to the domestic difficulties which produce matrimonial failures than is demanded of those who would be understanding and sympathetic judges of the laity. Christ condemned the Pharisees who laid heavy burdens and grievous to be borne on men's shoulders but would not lift a finger to relieve the heavy-laden. The clerical Houses of Convocation, we cannot but think, have pronounced a judgment more rigid and less humane than would have been pronounced by the Christian laity had they been consulted. We doubt whether our clerical authorities have sought, in this matter, to elicit the considered judgment of the English laity. Had they done so, we believe that the policy enunciated by the Houses of Convocation would have been very different from what it is. The words of Christ : ' He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone . . . ' carry more weight for laymen than for clergymen.

(3) The third reason for the decision of the Convocations is undoubtedly prompted by the alleged defective methods by which divorces are secured in the civil courts. It is charged against these methods that they encourage perjury and condone collusion, the upshot being that many persons who, as the result of these proceedings appear to be guilty partners, are innocent partners and *vice versa*. We understand that these defects have been in no small measure remedied by the Herbert Act. Nevertheless, the clergy rightly or wrongly believe the decisions of the civil courts to be untrustworthy and that the Church authorities must not rely upon them in judging of the guilt or innocence of the persons divorced. As a consequence our Church authorities have been led to assume that all divorced persons must be regarded as guilty and be treated as such. Such a decision seems outrageous to many lay people. They know, for instance, how many wives separated from their husbands by war conditions have proved themselves unfaithful and have in consequence been divorced. That these

injured husbands, on contracting a second marriage, should be denied the Church's solemnization and blessing seems to many Christian Englishmen to be essentially unjust and callous treatment on the part of the Church.

If the Church authorities claim the right to inflict such penalties on the laity, then the Church authorities must investigate each case before passing sentence. To assume that all are guilty in these cases and to treat them as such is monstrous.

'He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, are both alike an abomination unto the Lord.'

In each Diocese there ought to be a tribunal set up to decide whether the Church may or may not solemnize the second marriage of any divorced person who desires such solemnization. The tribunal should be weighty, representative, but very small. It should sit in secret and its procedure be informal and summary and no fees should be charged. We suggest that the tribunal should consist of four persons :

- (i) The Diocesan Bishop, who would act as Chairman and pronounce the decision of the tribunal.
- (ii) A married layman.
- (iii) A married lay-woman.
- (iv) The clergyman requested to solemnize the marriage.

Among the Jews, such a tribunal would be styled *Beth Din* (House of Judgment), but we hope that in Christian circles it would deserve the designation *Bethesda* (House of Mercy).

(4) The fourth reason for the decision of the Convocations is the growing influence of the Church of Rome on the worship, doctrine and practice of the Church of England. This sinister influence, which originated with the Oxford Movement, operates very largely through the clergy. Although the Orthodox Church (Greek and Eastern) practises a liberal policy in the case of the laity, allowing divorce and re-marriage for a number of valid reasons, the Church of Rome does not sanction divorce for any reason whatsoever. As the *Catholic Dictionary* explains :

'The Catholic understands our Lord to mean that the bond of marriage is always, even when one of the wedded parties has proved unfaithful, indissoluble . . . ' (Addis and Arnold, p. 548, 1884 edition).

The decision of the Houses of Convocation to which our Primate refers would seem at first sight to coincide with the policy of the Church of Rome; but — the Church of England wears her rue with a difference : she definitely makes Christ's ideal of marriage her standard of legal practice. The Church of Rome does nothing of the kind. Behind the decision of the Church of Rome on no account to sanction divorce, there stands in the shadow a system of ecclesiastical casuistry which releases people from their

matrimonial burdens—not at the foot of the Cross, but in the manner in which Mr. Worldly Wiseman's friends, Mr. Legality and Mr. Civility, might perform this delicate operation. The Church of Rome refuses to sanction divorce; but she practises 'nullification' of marriage, which permits those whose marriage is 'nullified' to marry again. The variety of causes for which nullification is granted are so ingenious and so intricate that a Roman Canonist trained in this department of casuistry could adduce sufficient cause for nullification of almost any marriage which it might seem worth while to nullify. But the scandals of the Roman nullification processes may not be narrated here. To do that would demand the erudition of H. C. Lea and G. G. Coulton, and the space of a pre-war volume.

When our Primate in his pronouncement expresses regret that our Church has not courts which 'could issue decrees of spiritual nullity,' we assume that *spiritual* here means *ecclesiastical*; but those who realize the dangerous lure exercised over our Anglo-Catholic clergy by Roman example can only hope that the Church of England will never be seduced into adopting the Roman method of the nullification of marriage.

What we have written of the Roman nullification of marriage must not be construed as implying direct or indirect criticism of nullification as practised in our English civil courts. Their decrees of nullity are granted for reasons which are entirely sound and straight-forward and commend themselves to the conscience and reason of Englishmen. No English civil court could dissolve marriages on grounds which are accepted as valid by the Church of Rome. The following recent occurrence may serve as a warning to English ecclesiastics who are seeking in this matter to assimilate Church of England practice to Roman practice.

An English soldier was married at a Registry Office. While the soldier was serving abroad, his wife became unfaithful. When he returned, finding her to be quite callous about her misconduct, he divorced her. Subsequently, he became engaged to a girl of good character and asked his Chaplain to marry them. The Chaplain replied that he could not do so because the Church would not allow it: nevertheless, he would put the case before the Bishop.

The Bishop wrote a sympathetic letter, but was adamant in his refusal to allow the couple to be married by the Chaplain: so they were married by the Registrar. Later the English Chaplain asked his fellow Roman Catholic Chaplain how such a case would have been dealt with by the Roman Church. The Roman Catholic Chaplain replied, 'We should have married them. You see the Catholic Church does not recognize a civil marriage to be a real marriage.'

The English Church authorities, if they propose to tread the Roman road, will find themselves compelled to go many stages further than that to which the resolutions of the four Houses of

Convocation have committed them. Cannot our Church authorities be persuaded to suspend this decision of the Houses of Convocation promulgated in this period of crisis and leave to the post-war Houses of Convocation the re-consideration of the Church's marriage policy? The present marriage practice of the Church of England is not that of the Apostolic Church as recorded in the New Testament, nor that of the Orthodox Greek Church, nor that of the Roman Church: but — what is far more serious — it is detrimental to the effective realization and promotion of Christian marriage in this country. The Church of England is not an infallible Church and has never claimed to be so. Why then should it not recognize this to-day and re-consider its marriage policy?

The Church of England took the wrong turning in its opposition to the marriage of the deceased wife's sister, but has — so we judge — recently changed its mind under the leadership of the Primate. The Church of England again took the wrong turning when it declined to respond to the recommendations made by the Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce (1909—1912) which singled out malicious desertion, cruelty, habitual drunkenness, incurable insanity and life-long imprisonment as additional reasons for divorce, maintaining that these evils could be as destructive of the purposes of married life as is adultery.

The Church of England has again taken a wrong turning, as a result of its refusal to distinguish between the innocent partner and the guilty partner, in prohibiting the marriage in church of all divorced persons who have a former partner living. Is there not a more excellent way? For some years past the Church of England has been cultivating closer relations with the Orthodox Churches which have even reached the stage of inter-communion. Why will not the Church of England seriously consider following the Greek rather than the Roman policy and practice when legislating for the marriage of the laity? We fervently hope that our Primate will lead the newly-elected post-war Convocations in implementing a Liberal Divorce and Marriage policy which, if realized, would promote Christian ideals of monogamous and life-long marriage to which the present policy of the Church is failing to attain. Christian leadership demands that our Church should become increasingly a Church not of the letter but of the Spirit, a fellowship governed by the Christian Spirit of religious, moral and rational freedom.

We favour no light-hearted taking of marriage vows in church which those who vow feel no serious obligation to observe. Only where there is good reason to believe that these vows will be taken seriously and observed faithfully should the Church administer

and solemnize them. But on the other hand, since there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance, we advocate strongly that in every case where there is serious repentance for past failure and misconduct by those who desire to re-build their home-life on Christian foundations, the Church should sanction and solemnize the re-taking of such broken vows and by prayer and blessing assist those who take them to fulfil them.

Does our Church really believe that by the grace of God men may rise on stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things? If the Church does so believe, then she ought to treat the penitent differently from the impenitent.

### CHURCH WEDDINGS AND NON-CONFORMIST MINISTERS

In the Diocese of London, where we have been given by the Press to understand that German bombs have created a wonderful spirit of Christian Fellowship and Fraternal Co-operation between the local clergy and Non-conformist ministers, a disconcerting — not to say devastating — incident recently occurred.

Sir Robert Gower, M.P., in arranging for his marriage at St. Peter's, Eaton Square, asked the vicar, Prebendary Kirk, if his life-long friend, a Non-conformist minister, the Rev. Sir Herbert Dunnico, former labour M.P. and Deputy-Speaker of the House of Commons, might be allowed to assist at the marriage. The vicar gladly consented, provided the Bishop of London's formal sanction was obtained. When approached, the Bishop refused consent.

The Bishop's action aroused considerable controversy in the Press. Finally, the point at issue received the particular attention of the Birmingham Diocesan Conference when the Bishop of Birmingham, in his Presidential Address, gave the following helpful advice to the clergy of his Diocese should they be requested to permit a Non-conformist minister to assist at a wedding in the Church of England.

'I am fairly frequently asked whether Free Church ministers can take part in weddings in our churches. I reply that the essential part of the service at any wedding must be taken by a clergyman of the Church of England: otherwise the wedding would not be legal. That clergyman must also sign the marriage register. If a clergyman allowed a Free Church minister actually to marry a couple, the marriage would be invalid and the clergyman might find himself successfully sued for large damages, or even brought up on a criminal charge for conniving at a bogus marriage. This matter is so important that I make my warning as emphatic and as blunt as I can.

'But the legal essentials of a wedding are a relatively small part of the service, and I see no reason why prayers or an address should not be given by a Free Church minister whose presence is desired by one of the

parties. I know that such co-operation is a recent development; it is none the worse for that. It is, I understand, not permitted elsewhere. I would reply that in many forms of co-operation with the Free Churches we have led and others have followed. Birmingham's motto is "Forward" (cited from the report of the *Birmingham Post*, May 5).

The Bishop of London, some weeks later, defending the use of St. Paul's Cathedral for a service commemorating the centenary of General Booth's conversion, wrote in *The Times* (July 5th) in justification of this innovation :

'The great struggle of our times is between Christianity and various forms of paganism. It is at a critical stage. We are bound to ask who are our allies and who our enemies; and we should not only recognize, but thankfully acknowledge, that other Christian bodies are our allies in the defence of our Christian heritage.'

This being so, it is difficult to understand why the Bishop of London prohibited Sir Herbert Dunnico from assisting at a wedding in the Church of England.

If it be maintained that the Bishop did so because it was in accordance with certain regulations he had recently issued prohibiting Non-conformist ministers to assist at services in English churches, the further question demands to be answered: 'What induced the Bishop of London to issue these regulations?'

Surely all who desire the increasing influence of the Christian Religion in this country must desire also to obliterate the spirit of 'Black Bartholomew, 1662, and all that.'

#### ANGLO-CATHOLICISM *versus* B.B.C. RELIGION.

Anglo-Catholicism is highly dissatisfied with B.B.C. religion. This growing sense of grievance culminated in an interview between Dr. Welch, the Director of Religious Broadcasting, and the Rev. Harold Riley, the General Secretary of the Church Union, the society which represents Anglo-Catholicism in this country. The interview took the form of answers to eight questions formulated by the Church Union concerning 'the principle and method' of religious broadcasting, and the answers given to them by Dr. Welch. These questions and answers, together with a leading article on the interview — 'Faith and Broadcasting' — were published in the *Church Times* of June 30th.

Dr. Welch's answers made it clear that a large measure of freedom is allowed, except in the sphere of time, to those giving the religious broadcasts. All religious broadcasts are 'vetted' as a precaution against giving information to the enemy and needless offence to fellow-Christians. This 'vetting' is done, not by a government department, nor by B.B.C. officials generally, but by ordained members of the B.B.C. Sacramental services are ex-

cluded : ordered Christian worship with prayers, hymns, Scripture readings and sermons constitute the main elements of the religious broadcasts, and these do not take place at the times of the regular Church Services except at the great festivals.

The purpose of religious broadcasting, so Dr. Welch emphasized, is to provide for those who cannot, or will not, attend public worship : it is primarily evangelistic and educational — a ministry of the Word, not of the Sacraments. 'Two million adults listen regularly to broadcasts who are not yet attached to any religious body.' The combination of good will, good sense and religious reverence which characterize the B.B.C.'s method and principle in its religious work have, we believe, the support and sympathy of the vast majority of the English public. Anglo-Catholic hostility expressed by the *Church Times* finds vent in such phrases as 'accommodated religion,' 'mutilation of liturgical offices,' 'arbitrary changes and excisions in the offices of the Book of Common Prayer,' 'flabby palpitation.' The grand finale is reached in the following paragraph :

The B.B.C. 'has had from the start an open field of experiment in the religious education of England: but that field has been continually cratered by the bombination of enthusiasts owning half-hearted allegiance to any organized Christian community, who confuse Christianity with uplift while they equate definite Churchmanship with unwarranted prejudice.'

How are we to account for this Anglo-Catholic hostility? Frankly, it seems to us to be due fundamentally to two causes. The Anglo-Catholic does not understand the modern English character in its attitude towards religion. Anglo-Catholicism demands a religion which is essentially dogmatic, ecclesiastical, sacramental. For the average English citizen these elements in the Christian religion have very little attraction. Church attendance statistics prove this up to the hilt. It is the increase in the dogmatic, ecclesiastical and sacramental elements in the public worship of the English Church, brought about by the Oxford Movement, which has been one of the factors in the silent desertion from our parish churches.

The B.B.C. knows this, and shews that it does by its religious services. It understands the English religious temperament and taste : the Englishman's sense of religious need and how to meet it; and that is why so many English people, who do not attend Public Worship, are making use of the B.B.C. services.

Some years ago the Anglo-Catholic Movement believed it was going to 'catholicize' the English people, but it has failed dismally in its crusade. What the Anglo-Catholic Movement has achieved is the 'catholicizing' of a large number of our clergy, and the consequent 'catholicizing' of many of our church services.

It has also succeeded in securing control of much of the machinery of the Church of England; but these successes have been accompanied by an increasing failure to win the English laity. It is painfully obvious to-day that while the clergy are going in one direction the laity are going in another. It is this failure by Anglo-Catholicism to understand the English religious temperament, and adjust its religious ministrations accordingly, which is the first reason for Anglo-Catholic hostility to B.B.C. religion.

The second reason for this hostility is that Anglo-Catholicism also fails to understand the essential character of the Christian religion. That religion is not primarily and essentially dogmatic, ecclesiastical and sacramental. The Christian religion possesses certain fundamental postulates of Christian faith and is based on them, but these postulates of Christian faith are offered to mankind not dogmatically but experimentally. They are working hypotheses and demand to be accepted that they may be put to the test of Christian life and action. When the Christian Faith is presented in this way, the modern Englishman is attracted by it. The Christian religion has a place for the Christian Church, a place for the Christian ministry, a place for the Christian sacraments—but it is a subordinate place. These things are means, not ends—servants, not masters. When they are exalted above measure, as is done by Anglo-Catholicism, the spiritual character of the Christian religion suffers and Christian freedom, Christian truth, Christian comprehensiveness, suffer also and the Christian religion becomes the religion of the letter, the religion of a tyrannical institution, and not the religion of the Spirit. The modern Englishman, although for the most part he knows too little of Christian origins and Church history to justify this spiritual conception of Christianity (which conflicts with the Anglo-Catholic conception of it), yet has intuitively grasped it, possibly because he still knows something of the teaching of Jesus Christ and the New Testament, possibly also because, as Tertullian wrote, 'The human soul is naturally Christian.'

Hence the conflict between Anglo-Catholic religion and B.B.C. religion is no mere superficial and temporary difference, but is fundamental. 'Men may differ about small things' said Aristotle, 'but the reasons for their difference are never small.'

#### CHRISTIANIZING THE LORD'S PRAYER

The *Guardian* of June 23, 1944, published a significant article by the Rev. R. O. P. Taylor, suggesting that in our use of the Lord's Prayer, instead of concluding with the Doxology 'For Thine is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory,' we should

substitute 'Through Jesus Christ our Lord' or 'Through Jesus Christ our Lord who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, one God, World without end.' Mr. Taylor's reason for this suggestion is that the Lord's Prayer seems to end too abruptly when it concludes with the words 'Deliver us from Evil.' Mr. Taylor states that :

'The Lord's Prayer, as originally framed and taught by Christ, ended with "Deliver us from evil."'

This statement is much too positive. The Lukan Version of the Lord's Prayer does not contain the clause 'Deliver us from Evil' but ends with the words 'Lead us not into temptation.' There are sound reasons for holding that the Lukan form of the Lord's Prayer may be closer to the original words of our Lord than is Matthew's version in the Sermon on the Mount. Mr. Taylor is quite right in regarding the Doxology 'For Thine is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory,' to which we English Christians are accustomed both in the Authorized Version (*Mt.* vi, 13) and in our Prayer Book usage, as not being part of the original Lord's Prayer but a primitive Jewish-Christian addition to it inspired by synagogue models. This Doxology, consistently used by the Greek Church, is omitted by the Latin Church. It is natural, however, that our English Prayer Book which is derived in part from both Greek and Latin sources, should direct the use of the Lord's Prayer both with the Doxology and without the Doxology.

Mr. Taylor writes :

'Force of habit makes us feel that we are pulled up abruptly, when we are stopped at "Deliver us from evil." But I cannot agree that this wholly accounts for the feeling of incompleteness when the ending is not used . . . '

'The prayer was prescribed at a time when the disciples were only beginning to grasp the purpose of Christ's life.'

This sense of incompleteness in the Lord's Prayer when the Matthaean Doxology is not used, Mr. Taylor holds, can be best remedied by adding the words 'Through Jesus Christ our Lord,' with the further addition of 'who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, one God, World without end.' This ending, Mr. Taylor believes, would serve as a constant reminder, when using the Lord's Prayer, that we owe the prayer to Christ, that it contains the selection of ideas which Jesus Himself made and enjoined, and would further serve to remind Christians of 'His work' for them. To end the Lord's Prayer thus would 'short-circuit' the danger of forgetting how much we owe to Jesus Christ.

This proposal is well intended but is open to serious objection. To implement it would suggest that the Lord's Prayer is imperfect, and that it can be improved by modern liturgists. The asser-

tion that it is a perfect prayer and the pattern prayer for mankind is a foundation-stone of the Christian Religion. Any suggestion that it is not adequate for mature Christians is entirely contrary to the primitive Christian conviction that it is essentially the prayer for mature Christians rather than for the immature (its use in certain cases was denied to Catechumens), being indeed as it has been called 'the family prayer of the Christian fellowship.'

We remember a Plymouth Brother in Queen Victoria's days declaring that the Lord's Prayer ought not to be used and was never intended to be used by those who are Christians (*i.e.* who know themselves to be saved by faith in the Sacrifice of Christ). The Lord's Prayer, so the Plymouth Brother maintained, exhibits its immaturity by teaching those who use it to pray for forgiveness on the ground that they forgive others, whereas since the Crucifixion the only ground on which a Christian can plead to God for forgiveness is faith in the merits of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice. This objection to the Lord's Prayer sets at nought Christ's teaching that penitence, the forgiveness of others, and the spirit of love in our lives and hearts are essential for those who would receive the Divine forgiveness.

The addition of the formula 'Through Jesus Christ our Lord' strikes us not only as a literary anachronism, which the Matthaean Doxology is not, but is apt to give the impression that concluding a prayer with this formula makes it a Christian prayer. This is entirely erroneous. Bishop Gore in his admirable exposition of the Lord's Prayer in his volume, *The Sermon on the Mount*, writes:

'Whatever particular object we may want to pray for, we have never prayed for it aright till we have prayed for it in the words and spirit of the Lord's Prayer. That, I repeat, is not one prayer among many. It covers all legitimate Christian praying, and indeed the saying of it affords the best test whether our wants of the moment can become a prayer offered "in the name of Christ."'

'... The Lord's Prayer is the great prayer in His name. You know how many people have a very strangely childish notion that praying in the name of Christ means simply the addition of the words "through Jesus Christ our Lord" at the end of their prayers. But depend upon it they do not by adding these words, or any other words, bring it about that their prayers should be in the name of Christ. To pray in the name of Christ means to pray in such a way as represents Christ . . .'

'Therefore, as this Lord's Prayer represents profoundly and perfectly the spirit of Him Who first spoke it, and Who taught it to His Church, it follows that it is, beyond all other prayers, the prayer in Christ's name.'

In view of such teaching as this about prayer in Christ's name, our Prayer Book revisers might do well to drop the well-worn formula 'Through Jesus Christ our Lord' and its variants appended to so many of our Church Prayers, and examine whether the prayers themselves are really true to Christ's teaching and example

as given in the Lord's Prayer, and if not, revise them accordingly. There are certainly some of our Church Prayers which could be improved when tested by this standard.

To Christianize our Church Prayers in the light of the Lord's Prayer, rather than to attempt to Christianize the Lord's Prayer under the influence of later development in Church Doctrine, seems to us the right course to take.

### THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC NEW DEAL

The leading article in the *Church Times* of July 7, 1944, opens thus :

Nothing is gained from blinking the fact that for some time the Catholic movement in the Church of England has ceased to move. It has been without a clearly defined purpose ; it has lacked outstanding leaders ; it no longer enlists the enthusiasm of youth.

The *Church Times*, however, is not without hope. The Church Union, the official representative of Anglo-Catholicism in this country, promises to galvanize Anglo-Catholicism into renewed activity. Stimulated by the energetic leadership of its new Secretary, Rev. Harold Riley, the Church Union has produced a plan of action under six heads.

(1) Unity in faith, for which literature is to be prepared and conventions for priests planned ; (2) conformity in worship, for which a committee is drawing up a scheme ; (3) reunion with the other branches of the Church and with Nonconformity ; (4) social action ; (5) evangelism among those who are ignorant of the faith or completely misunderstand it ; and (6) Church Reform.

Under the last head, Mr. Riley would put the appointment of bishops in some way that would give the Church a voice in their selection, and the restoration of synodical rule in the dioceses. He also stands for a revision of payment for clergymen, so that work and remuneration have a closer relationship.

Finally, he believed that the Church cannot take her proper position in the land till far more priests staff the parishes.

No strenuous English Churchman, whether Liberal, Evangelical or Anglo-Catholic, could possibly take exception to the *framework* of this plan of action. What could be better than (1) Unity in Faith : (2) Conformity in Worship : (3) Christian Reunion : (4) Social Action : (5) Evangelism : (6) Church Reform ? But, as Captain Cuttle remarked : ' The force of this observation lies in its application.'

What do our Anglo-Catholics include under these six headings, and how do they propose to apply their programme ? Unless we know this, co-operation of Liberals and Evangelicals with Anglo-Catholics becomes impossible. Yet what the Church of England needs to-day is a comprehensive plan of action in which Liberals and Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics can helpfully

unite. This comprehensive programme demands for its loyal acceptance clear definition and a spirit of tolerance and fundamental loyalty to the principles and practice of the Church of England. We cannot undertake to define and stress here the 'marks of the Church of England,' but would refer our readers to Bishop Creighton's *Life and Charges*,<sup>1</sup> which stress comprehensiveness and continuity, order and freedom, the appeal to sound learning and the Holy Scriptures as the most important of these 'marks.'

As Liberals we think it may be helpful to state here what we desiderate under each of these six headings; but we recognize that Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals have also their contribution to make to the comprehensive plan desired. When each of these three schools states its demands with absolute frankness, it will then be possible to attempt the welding of all three classes of demands into a common programme of united action.

(1) *Unity in Faith.* Liberals demand unity in faith only in essentials because they are assured (a) that unity cannot be secured in our Church if we go beyond essentials, and (b) that it would be to the disadvantage of the influence of the Christian Church on those outside it, if it included non-essentials. The Liberals' motto is: '*In essentials, unity: in non-essentials, liberty: in all things, charity.*'

Recognizing the difficulties which the traditional Creeds cause to some conscientious Church people who cannot affirm all their clauses in the traditional sense, liberals are urgent that our Church should authorize, in addition to the ancient Creeds, a number of modern Confessions of Faith which could not only be said or sung at our Church Services but also be used in the preparation of candidates for Confirmation. Of course the use of these modern formularies of faith would be as voluntary alternatives and only in such churches and at such services as the representatives of the congregation expressly desired. There are, we know, a number of such modern creeds in use at the present time; but it is highly desirable that this practice should receive Church authorization.

(2) *Conformity in Worship.* Liberals favour this provided it does not mean the return to uniformity in worship. To attempt to restore uniformity in worship would be as troublesome as it would be disastrous. Here also Liberals urge the authorization of a number of alternative services of different types to be used when and where the parishioners desire them. Of course these alternative services (Anglo-Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal) must

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton.* Ed. by his Wife. (Longmans, 1904.)

be loyal to the liturgical ideals of the Book of Common Prayer and must not seek to undo the work of the Reformation by the revival of pre-Reformation errors and superstitions. When these alternative services have been duly authorized in addition to those of 1662, the clergy ought to give dutiful obedience to this policy of comprehensive and helpful enlargement of our Church's Public Worship and abstain from all unauthorized deviations from it.

(3) *Reunion.* (a) Liberal Churchmen stand for Christian reunion which as a first step welcomes all communicants of all Christian bodies as fellow-communicants at the Lord's table in our parish churches. (b) Liberal Churchmen also desire to welcome ministers of all Christian denominations who wish to assist in the administration of the Service as fellow-ministers with our clergy at our Services of Holy Communion. (c) Liberal Churchmen also desire as a factor in Christian reunion that the local authorities in every parish shall be granted the right to admit into the pulpit of their parish church ministers of other Christian denominations. (d) To attempt to secure agreement with other Christian bodies in matters doctrinal and ecclesiastical as a needful preliminary to Christian reunion has led to an enormous amount of discussion extending over many years, and has only achieved the most meagre results. Liberal Churchmen are convinced that it is *practical* unifying action in the sphere of Church fellowship and co-operation which can alone secure effective Christian reunion.

(4) *Social Action.* Liberal Churchmen desire social action particularly by the creation of local Christian fellowships in which members of all the local denominations can co-operate to the benefit of the social life of the community, especially by the development of a sense of individual responsibility for local social conditions and moral reform.

Liberal Churchmen are not lovers of 'politics in the pulpit' which are better suited for the political party platform.

(5) *Evangelism.* Liberal Churchmen believe in evangelism of what is commonly called our 'pagan population,' but they are convinced that effective evangelism must take the form of modern Christian education. Many well-intentioned attempts to evangelize those 'outside the Church' are useless because the Christian Religion is not presented in such a way as either to attract or enlighten or convert those for whose benefit it is presented. The religious programmes of the B.B.C. have effectively replaced street preaching as a method of evangelism in this country. What is particularly desired from the religious denominations is their contribution to sound modern Christian education in all our schools which will concentrate upon the formation of Christian character

and conduct, Christian manners and morals, Christian outlook and spirit.

This work in the schools needs pre-eminently to be supplemented by the recreation of English home-life on a stronger religious and social foundation. Of course the Victorian home is out of date and has very largely disappeared, but in most cases no worthy home-life has been created as a substitute for it. Our legislators are very properly giving much thought to the rebuilding of our material homes. The function of the Church is to inspire the rebuilding of our spiritual homes. This is a task of immense difficulty and demands many-sided efforts and cannot be accomplished quickly, but the future welfare of our country depends upon its effective accomplishment. Modern Christian education combined with the re-creation of home-life constitutes that kind of evangelism on which the Liberal Churchman feels there is the greatest need to concentrate to-day.

(6) *Church Reform*, which occupies itself in tinkering with the Church's relations to the State and interference with the competent administration of the Church's financial resources by Q.A.B., the Liberal Churchman abhors. In the sphere of Church finance, what is really needed is not the redistribution of our present financial resources but the increase of them. If our Church were giving the nation the religion it desires, we are quite certain that the nation would not hesitate to contribute all that is required in the financial sphere. Not only those who seek the Kingdom of God but also those who effectively promote it have all things needful for this life added unto them. This is as true of the Church as it is of individuals. Pathetic financial appeals and pretentious financial schemes promulgated by clergymen and bishops are for the most part as humiliating as they are unproductive. This is really the task of the laity, and it should be left to them. It is Church Reforms which concern themselves with our Church's teaching, our Church's public worship, and the training of our clergy in the right way, which Liberal Churchmen desire to promote and on which, as they believe, the Church's influence depends.

We believe as Liberal Churchmen that if this six-point liberal programme were adopted by our Church authorities as a basis and aim of 'The Church looks forward' policy, it would secure not only the support of Liberal Churchmen but also of Evangelical Churchmen and of a certain number of Liberal Anglo-Catholic Churchmen whose war experience is enlarging their outlook and diverting it from Romeward aspirations. Above all, this six-point Liberal policy, if implemented, could and would do much to win back the millions of our countrymen who have been alienated from the Church of England.

## A CHINESE PRECEDENT

On January 25th, 1944, being the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, the English Bishop of Hong-kong admitted a Chinese Deaconess, Lei Tim Oi, to the priesthood. Exceptional circumstances due to the Japanese invasion of China seemed to necessitate her ordination to the priesthood.

'After leaving a Government school, Miss Lei Tim Oi responded to a call for Chinese girls to become deaconesses, and received her training at the Union Theological College, Canton. She was admitted to the order of deaconesses in St. Paul's Church, Hong-kong, twelve years ago. At first, when she became in sole charge of the work at Kowloon, a priest visited the congregation once a month to celebrate the Holy Communion. Then illness and the Japanese occupation made travelling uncertain, and the Bishop of Hong-kong saw fit to overcome the difficulty by ordaining her priest.'

The Rt. Rev. Bishop Hall, who ordained her, has been Bishop of Hong-kong since 1932. Educationally he is a product of Brasenose College, Oxford, and Cuddesdon College. His pastoral and missionary experience, especially with the Student Christian Movement and the Young Men's Christian Association, converted him into an internationally and interdenominationally-minded Christian. His action in ordaining a woman to the priesthood has given deep offence to the *Church Times*. Its editorial of July 28th assails the Bishop's action as a 'flagrant breach of the working principles of the Church,' and brands the Bishop as 'a wild man of the woods.' The *Church Times* anticipates that when the war is over 'the great mass of Churchmen throughout the world' will expect the Chinese Church to issue a formal and categorical condemnation of the Bishop's action. The editorial concludes with this minatory sentence:

'If the Church in China should fail in this, its obvious duty to Christ's Catholic Church and to the Anglican Communion in particular, we cannot doubt but that other Anglican Churches will take unmistakable steps to express their own sense of its failure to discharge the responsibilities of loyalty to Catholic principle.'

The *Church Times* opines, however, that although the matter must be considered by the next Lambeth Conference, the Conference will declare that under the circumstances the Bishop of Hong-kong's action was 'eminently well pleasing to God and must never be repeated.'

We fear that South China is about to replace South India as the battle-ground between the contending forces of a rigid traditionalism and a liberal progressive Christianity. It is of course impossible to assert with any show of reason that the Christian Religion prohibits what Bishop Hall has done. Even St. Paul, who seems to have felt that women ought to be kept in subjection yet affirmed that 'in Christ there is neither male nor female'—in

other words, that women in the Christian Church stand on an equal spiritual footing with men. No one who knows the history of the Christian Church can fail to recognize the enormous benefits which the Church has derived from the devoted service and noble example of Christian women. Why, then, were not women as a matter of course appointed to the higher offices of the Christian Ministry? This was due, we believe, simply to the fact that it was not customary in the ancient world in which Christianity originated, for women to exercise public functions. To-day when in our modern civilization an increasing number of women are occupying public administrative posts of great importance, it is only natural that women should be admitted to the higher ranks of the Christian Ministry. We believe, however, that the strongest opponents to the admission of women to the Ministry are women themselves. The whole question is not one of Christian principle but of practical benefit. As to women being made priests, by which they are authorized to administer Holy Communion, there can be no possible objection, seeing that unordained women have since the earliest times been permitted to administer the greater Sacrament of Baptism in cases of urgency.

Whether women should be admitted to the orders of priests and bishops in the English Church is primarily a matter for the laity to decide. If the laity desire women to minister in these offices, then women ought to be ordained to them. To-day the difficulty in the English Church is to discover what is the considered judgment of the laity, since our lay representative bodies in the Church, save in the case of Parochial Church Councils, are singularly unrepresentative of normal lay feeling.

We hope that the Bishop of Hong-kong will not be intimidated by the outcry of the *Church Times*: we hardly think that he will. It is recorded that at an Ordination Service in his Cathedral, he invited a Lutheran and a Congregationalist to join with him in the laying on of hands. An English Bishop who has dared to do this has become possessed of an ideal of Christian Catholicity over which the timidities of traditionalism and the scruples of sectarian 'Catholicism' have no power.

### THE CROCKS, THE CROOKS, AND THE CRANKS OF THE CLOTH

An article in the *Guardian* of July 14th, contributed by the Rev. S. L. Caiger, criticizes the three disciplinary measures designed to deal with unsatisfactory incumbents.

'Briefly, Measure No. 1 (650 B) deals with the aged and infirm vicar who refuses to resign. Measure No. 2 (651 B) has its eye on the vicar who is guilty of neglecting his duties or of "unbecoming conduct." And Measure No. 3 aims at expelling the unpopular square peg in a round hole.'

These unsatisfactory incumbents have been described as 'The Crocks, the Crooks and the Cranks of the Cloth.'

We rejoice with Mr. Caiger that the Church Assembly, which in June was to have set the seal of its final approval on these three measures, has been prevented from doing so. The three measures are open to serious objection: but it is no easy matter for clergymen to criticize them publicly without seeming to be defenders of weaknesses in our parochial system which demand to be remedied. The measures themselves, should they be legalized, seem to us to be likely to produce far greater ills than those they seek to remedy. Mr. Caiger's article, characterized by a spirit of good sense and sweet reasonableness, will convince many of his readers that this is the case. 'The Crocks, the Crooks, and the Cranks of the Cloth,' on whose shoulders the three strings of his whip of clerical discipline are designed to fall, are calculated to be 2 per cent. of the parochial clergy. This is really a very small percentage considering the ills to which human flesh is heir; and provided the percentage does not rise higher, it seems to us it will be better for the Church to bear the ills she has than fly to others that she knows not of.

Many humane Churchmen, possessed of a judicial mind and legal training, will look askance at these three measures—not only because of the strange methods which they sanction in dealing with these three classes of unfortunates, but also because of the incentives which these measures provide for troublesome parishioners to persecute their parish priests. To-day, the pastor's lot is not an easy one; he is beset by difficulties of no ordinary kind; and sympathetic Churchmen will not wish to add to his troubles. Undoubtedly there are cases where a parish does suffer from its pastor being a Crock, a Crank or a Crook, and something ought to be done about it. It is primarily the duty of the Diocesan Bishop to do it in his Diocese. It is said that in a number of cases the Bishop is powerless. This is really not so. The Bishop has great disciplinary power conferred on him by the Clergy Discipline Act of 1892 and the Ecclesiastical Duties Act of 1926.

No Clerical Crook who is proved to be a crook, not by parochial slander but by judicial methods, can retain his benefice. Cranks of the Cloth who cannot be interned in a mental hospital have to be suffered: but even here it may be possible for the Bishop by exerting his personal influence in private to do much to remedy the situation. Many of the parochial clergy, knowing as they do the immense personal influence which their Bishop can exercise in a private interview, wonder that he does not make use of it in more cases. All in authority can well understand why he does not. Such interviews are more exacting for the interviewer

than for the interviewed, and a prelate of Christian disposition is apt to excuse himself by the assumption that such an interview will be useless.

In the case of the Clerical Crock, the difficulty which prevents his resignation is invariably a financial one. Most of these cases could be remedied if the Bishop and his coadjutors are resolved to settle them in a humane and practical manner. This, however, demands the preliminary creation of a supplementary Pension Fund in every Diocese to be placed in the hands of the Bishop for use in such special cases.

It seems to us infinitely better to make the most of the paternal influence and legal powers which the Bishops already possess rather than resort to the deplorable methods which would be sanctioned by legalizing these three measures—methods which encourage delation: accept evidence not given on oath nor followed by public cross-examination: and which even deny to the accused the right of legal defence. We hope that if the Church Assembly is ever called on to give final consideration to these measures, it will take to heart the lesson of Aesop's fable of the Husbandman, the Hare and the Huntsman—with its moral that remedies can be worse than the evils they seek to remove—and relegate these three measures to the limbo of forensic ineptitudes and the hard cases that make bad law.

#### 'THE MENACING DRIFT FROM ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY.'

At the summer session of the Convocation of York (reported in *The Times* of May 26) a significant discussion took place on a well-worn theme—the drift of the English-speaking people from the Christian Religion.

The Bishop of Carlisle (Dr. Williams) moved: 'That Convocation, recognizing that there is a growing breach between the thought of the clergy and that of the people, records its twofold conviction that the Gospel is the divine answer to the fundamental problems of thought and life, and that its effective proclamation requires of the Church a fuller understanding, not only of the Gospel itself, but also of the present situation.'

The Bishop said that the Christian influence in social movements to-day was becoming weaker and weaker. If there was to be a revival of religion, they needed a great rebirth of poetry and of the highest forms of literature such as happened in the Victorian age. They could prepare the ground for such a revival by seeking more to bring the Church to the world and refraining from asking the world to return to the Church. They should try to find modes of worship more adequate to the needs of the present day.

The Bishop of Southwell (Dr. Barry), seconding, suggested that the ordinary Churchman was not alive to the menacing drift of the English-speaking world from religion. What was wanted was a dynamic theology, not one that was static and prefabricated. They must take care

not to present to the people something that was little more than Judaism and bore no relation to contemporary experience. Far too much contemporary theology was in danger of drawing religion away from the world we lived in.

The Archbishop of York (Dr. Garbett) said that it was impossible to exaggerate the gravity of the present situation. They needed to state the Gospel in the most simple and direct terms to the great mass of people, who were totally ignorant of the most elementary facts of the Christian faith.

As we see it, the causes of this undeniable drift from the Christian Religion are many. For some of them the Church is to blame: for others the Church is not to blame. For instance, the Church is not to blame for the coming of the motor-car, motor-bus and motor-bike, and their use by Sunday trippers: nor for the advent of the films by attendance at which, as Dr. Inge remarked, our populace lower their morals at the expense of their eyesight: nor for the increased misuse of sport to promote organized gambling on a national scale. The clergy are powerless to check effectively the influence which these things have contributed to the national drift from religion and morality. Another undoubted influence hostile to religion quite beyond the power of the clergy to prevent is the loss to the higher side of our national life caused by the premature death in the Great War of tens of thousands of the noblest Englishmen. Another force hostile to organized Christianity in this country has been the atheistic movements represented pre-eminently by Marxism and Nazism on the Continent. All these things have weakened the influence of Christianity on English life; but it would be most unjust to blame the English clergy for the detrimental influence of these things on morals and religion.

There are, however, spheres in which the Church has been to blame. We all know them so well that to repeat them here would be more wearisome than a twice-told tale. The Church has grievously failed as a teacher of the Christian Religion. She has been a slave to traditionalism and has fought again and again on the side of old error against new truth and has not yet repented. As a leader in Divine Worship the Church has winked at the introduction into our Church Services of corruptions and superstitions linked to mediaeval teaching all most definitely rejected at the Reformation. For some years there was energetic protest against this Romeward movement in the English Church. This period of energetic protest has now for some time past been succeeded by a period of silent desertion from the Church.

Moreover, the conviction has increased in well-informed circles that an underground movement is developing in the Church of England which has for its aim either to make her a Uniat Church

within the Papal obedience, or to make her a Catholic Church of the Roman type but independent of the Papacy. This policy is simply suicidal and must assuredly end in the disestablishment, disendowment and disintegration of our national Church. The English people as a whole have no use for Romanism. They do not regard the Papacy — and for very good reasons — as a friend of the British Empire. It is of interest in this connection to observe the marked reduction in the number of conversions to Rome during the last few years.

The 'Catholicizing' of the English Church, as distinct from the Romanizing of it, is something which the English people as a whole do not understand. It seems to them that 'Catholicizing,' if not precisely identical with Romanizing, must inevitably end in it and destroy the characteristic features both of English Divine Worship and English religious teaching and practice. If the Church of England will not be true to herself, there is no reason for her continued existence. No Church possesses such potentialities as does the Church of England. If she be true to herself she may yet deserve the name with which Dean Church saluted her: 'The most splendid Church in Christendom.'

Many things are needful if our Church is to accomplish this. The Free Churches must without delay be admitted to a fellowship which is not a fluctuating co-operation but genuine intercommunion. The Church must give whole-hearted support to a policy of Christian education which will win not only the co-operation of more enlightened Christian educationists in this country, but will secure the respect of Agnostics and Secularists. In order to advance such an educational policy the Church must train her candidates for the ministry on modern lines. The educational standard of the clergy is lower than it was before the Great War and their general culture is declining. Some Churches may not require well educated and cultured clergy, but it is essential for the influence of the Church of England that her clergy should be men of culture and intellectual power. Our Deans and Chapters who were retained at the Reformation for the express purpose of promoting sound learning in the Church and defending Reformation principles have fallen intellectually much below the level of forty years ago. No doubt our two great wars are responsible in some measure for the decline.

The tasks ahead of our Church are extremely difficult and exacting, and only the most courageous, enlightened and statesmanlike leadership can under Providence save the situation and make our Church the spiritual and moral leader of the English people — *Ecclesia gentis Anglorum* — both at home and beyond the seas.

## IN MEMORIAM

## ADELA MARION ADAM

On May 12th, in Cambridge, Adela Marion Adam, a very old member of the Modern Churchmen's Union, 'put on immortality.' She was the daughter of an Oxford don, Arthur Kensington, Fellow of Trinity College; and she married a Cambridge don, James Adam, Fellow of Emanuel College. She herself was also a don, Staff Lecturer of Girton College, of whose Governing Body she was a member for twenty years.

She was a brilliant classical scholar, and took two firsts in the Classical Tripos. When her distinguished husband died prematurely, after his delivery of the Gifford Lectures (1904-6) on *The Religious Teachers of Greece*, she supervised their publication and prefaced them with an inspiring memoir of a noble personality. In 1910, she contributed an essay marked by fine critical judgment, 'Greek Ideals of Righteousness,' to a slim but very valuable volume entitled *Early Ideals of Righteousness, Hebrew, Greek and Roman*. Her two fellow-contributors were Professor Kennett and Professor Gwatkin. She also wrote a well-known volume on *Plato; Moral and Political Ideas*.

She lost her son and son-in-law in the Great War and published a memoir of the former. She had much in common with Alice Gardner of Newnham, whose brother, Professor Percy Gardner, wrote Dr. Adam's life in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. As an accomplished musician, Mrs. Adam took a prominent part in the musical life of Cambridge.

In her religion, she was a modern Christian Humanist inheriting the great traditions of the Oxford Humanists of the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, together with those of the Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century. She was as free from fanaticism as she was from obscurantism, the possessor of a classical culture which knew nothing of a gnosticism and nothing of materialism. Perhaps the act which commemorates her most characteristically is her reading to her dying husband the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel of St. John in *Greek*. H.D.A.M.

## ARTHUR HENRY GARNSEY

The Modernist cause in the Australian Commonwealth has lost a valiant and able supporter by the decease of Arthur Henry Garnsey. Australian born, he was educated in the Commonwealth and graduated in 1894, in the University of Sydney. His early studies were classical; but later he devoted himself to theological studies and finally became a Fellow of the Australian College of

Theology. He was ordained in 1897, and after holding several pastoral posts he concentrated on education and was particularly interested in training students for Holy Orders.

He was appointed Warden of St. John's College, Armidale, in 1907, and passed on to the Wardenship of St. Paul's College in the University of Sydney, holding this post from 1916 until 1940. He became a Canon of Armidale Cathedral and later a Canon of Sydney. He was examining chaplain to various prelates, including the Archbishop of Sydney, and attained the distinction of being elected a Senator of Sydney University. He was a close friend and champion of that notable Australian Presbyterian scholar, Professor Angus.

Loyal to the principles and practice of the Church of England, Canon Garnsey was also a strong believer in a progressive and dynamic Christianity, and never hesitated to range himself on the side of Truth and Freedom in Christian communities not all notably conspicuous for their devotion to critical research and progressive thinking in the sphere of religion.

Canon Garnsey had two links with the University of Oxford. He was a nephew of a Fellow of Magdalen who caused some innocent merriment in University circles by leaving a legacy to his college on condition that not a single penny of it was to be spent on education. Later, when Canon Garnsey visited Oxford, Magdalen — loyal like all Oxford colleges to the memory of its benefactors — invited the Canon to dine in Hall and join the Fellows in the Senior Common Room enlarged and renovated by his uncle's legacy.

Canon Garnsey's son, David, was a Rhodes Scholar of New College, Oxford, and a student of Ripon Hall, becoming curate of the University Church from 1934 to 1938. H.D.A.M.

## THE LOGIC OF REAL KNOWING

By the Rev. H. C. SNAPE, M.A., Rector of Skelton.

EVERYONE is aware and many are weary of the antithesis and conflict between Science and Religion. It is customary to think of the conflict as one between differing conclusions. The classical argument of Religion leads to a universe rigidly divided into God, Man and Nature. The conclusions of the sciences present a world, where Man and Nature are closely akin and there is no overwhelming evidence in favour of the existence of God. Sometimes it is thought that the conflict has ceased because scientists now acknowledge the limitations of their field, leaving a *terra incognita* to theologians where they can again parade their ancient truths unassailed.

But to the student of the history of Logic the conflict, although on the surface it appeared to be a clash between two opposite points of view, is really a struggle between two logical methods, between the scientific method and that of Formal Logic. The method of Formal Logic is pre-Christian, an instrument perfected by Aristotle, adopted by the Greek fathers, impressing its stamp upon the Christian Religion in the formula of Chalcedon and the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas. The method claimed to express truth upon the assumption that words of themselves, apart from their context, are symbols of rigid, unchanging entities. The form is more important than the content. The premisses granted, the deductions can be formally and infallibly made. The Reformation was for Theology not a change of method but a change of premisses. Hence the conflict between Catholic and Protestant was incapable of any solution because both were arguing from different premisses by the same formal method. Both Catholic and Protestant used the Bible as the material for their premisses; both assumed that the words of themselves yielded their meaning; but each made their own selection of texts which they interpreted in accordance with their own prejudices without recognizing that their real meaning depended upon their context and the purpose of those who originally used them.

The conflict of the nineteenth century between Science and Religion appeared to be only another example of argument from different premisses. The Darwinians maintained that nature was a mechanism and that man was a fortuitous product of the mechanical processes of nature, while the churchman held that God had interfered in his own world to create man as a unique species. In reality it was a conflict between methods of knowing. The churchman assumed that knowledge of God was derived from initial premisses which were the product of divine revelation; the scientist was claiming that he could perceive in the natural world, including man, the reality of change. If change is real, then words do not of themselves apart from their context form rigid labels for rigid unchanging realities.

Neither the churchmen nor the scientists were aware that they were disputing about the reality of continuous change and the use of the appropriate method for dealing with such a reality. Just as M. Jourdain had been using prose all his life without knowing it—so the scientist had been accepting the continually changing as real and dealing with it by what is now called the 'scientific method,' without being aware of the novel procedure. The scientist imagined he was maintaining that Man was the product of an ape-like stock, but he was also unconsciously maintaining that the words 'man' and 'ape' do not express rigidly distinctive species

but are convenient labels to describe certain selected objects of a changing reality.

Fifty years later William James, and the neglected but brilliant Oxford philosopher, F. C. S. Schiller, and the French mathematician, Henri Poincaré, laid bare the full nature and implications of the scientific method and its bearings upon philosophic and religious studies. F. C. S. Schiller in his *Formal Logic* exposed the claims of Aristotelian Logic to reveal truth by showing that words and statements have no meaning apart from their context and the personal intentions of those who utter them, that the Aristotelian syllogism fails to reveal new truth because the middle term is always latently ambiguous. He pointed out the disastrous effects of Formal Logic upon Religion.

'No religions originally show themselves so obsessed with the idea of fixity; at their first appearance they do not conceive themselves as final, but all look forward to Messiahs, Second Comings, Mahdis, and other forms of future consummation. Their formulation into rigid Creeds which must be believed in every syllable, and on no account be revised, is a phenomenon which comes later, when logically trained theologians have got the religious movement under control' (p. 403, *Formal Logic*).

In a later volume (*Logic for Use*) Schiller examined the scientific method, calling it 'the logic of real knowing.' He disclosed that real knowing

'rests on personal meaning, purposive thought, freedom of choice between alternatives, desires, postulates, and interests, hazardous selection, probable reasoning, and unending verification . . . It eschews as illusory the notions of verbal meaning, purity, certainty, necessity, validity and coercion' (p. 441).

Facts are shown not to be the basic data of sense-experience but selected points of experience: principles and affirmations are shown not to be unalterable formulae but hypotheses verified by experience and subject to revision and expansion as knowledge progresses. Academic prejudice and the accident of controversy prevented the logic of the scientific method from being welcomed in the field of Theology even by liberal theologians. The Hegelian concept of the absolute was the philosophic fashion of Oxford, with the result that theologians who had passed through the Oxford school of philosophy were Hegelians and trained to be formal logicians. They were unused to the scientific method and hostile to the new Humanism.

Furthermore Pius X in the encyclical *Pascendi Domini Gregis* condemned both Roman Catholic Modernism and the new Humanism. Liberal Protestants judged the latter to be the philosophy of the former. Dr. Inge charged Humanism with measuring the truth of a religion by its utilitarian value, while he condemned Roman Catholic Modernism because it wished to divorce the Christ

of faith from the Jesus of history, to appraise the former as true for piety and devotion and to accept Schweitzer's estimate of the historical Jesus as a being unacceptable to the twentieth century.

Schiller unfortunately was not interested in the disputes of theologians. He had often pointed out that the verification required varied in each field of human enquiry. He wrote :

' In ordinary life we deal directly with an " external world " perceived through the senses ; in science with the same a little less directly : in either case our hypotheses appeal to some overt, visible, and palpable fact, by the observation of which they are adequately verified. But the data of the religious consciousness are mainly experiences of a more inward, spiritual, personal sort, and it is obvious that they can hardly receive the same sort of verification ' (*Studies in Humanism*, p. 362).

The Roman Catholic Modernists were not scientifically logical because they wished to retain the formal consistency of Catholic dogma and at the same time to reject as false its premiss of the historical Jesus. It was thus a mistake to equate the pragmatists with them. A pragmatist theologian would have indicated that a faith which is consciously founded upon a myth fails to provide what the religious impulse needs, the help of a being other than Man, active and real in human history. Schiller's interest was in the logic of the situation, and in an article on ' Infallibility and Toleration ' published in *Humanism* he showed that upon the principles of formal logic Pius X was bound to denounce Modernism, since the Roman Catholic Church is the historic example of formal logic in action.

The truth which the Roman Catholic Church claims to hold and the means of grace which it professes to administer are guaranteed by the canons of formal consistency. Its doctrine is a formally coherent system deduced by formally perfect syllogisms from premisses guaranteed by the assumed infallibility of the Church. The believer is not asked to verify the doctrine for himself ; he is called upon to submit his judgment to that of the Church. Once that is done, by the necessities of Formal Logic he must accept the whole system of the Church's doctrine and practice. The dogma of papal infallibility is only the logical keystone to the whole structure. If God has made His Church infallible, He will therefore make its head an infallible interpreter of its teaching. The Pope is therefore infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra* on faith and morals. The Pope asks for far less than the man in the street who claims infallibility for any judgment he may make. The Anglo-Catholic who swallows the camel of Catholic dogma and strains at the gnat of papal infallibility fails to see the inconsistency of his position. If you accept the methods of Formal Logic you have no reason to shrink at formal guarantees.

In the same way the Roman Church guarantees the reality of the grace it administers by the formal perfection of its instruments. Its priests are priests because they are ordained under the correct form to celebrate the mass and offer its sacrifice to heaven. Other ministries are defective not because they cannot claim an unbroken apostolic succession, but because their ordinal is defective and therefore has broken the succession.

Thus the claims of the Roman Church are in formal logic impossible to withstand, since they are deduced from premisses which themselves are formally guaranteed. Yet the illogical English mind refuses to draw the consequences which may be summarized as follows :

(1) An institution which by methods of Formal Logic claims to proclaim the truth and administer divine grace cannot accept any other body as its equal and cannot therefore contract a union with any other body. It is therefore futile to hope for reunion with Rome except on Rome's terms.

(2) No other institution can successfully make similar claims because it cannot present the same formal perfection. These consequences are clearly comprehended by Anglicans who have been members of the Roman Communion but have returned to the Church of their baptism, such as the late Alfred Fawkes and Mr. H. W. Poynter (v. *Modern Churchman*, vol. xxii, p. 501, sq. 'The Church of England as seen by a former Roman Catholic'). They appear to be hidden from the Anglican layman, who cannot understand why his Roman Catholic friend will not worship in the parish church on a civic occasion, and by the Archbishop of York who at his diocesan conference last year expressed his belief that union with Rome is not an impossible dream.

Is there any other way out for the Protestant except to submit to the institution which claims to possess unity in truth because its claims are justified in Formal Logic? His own formal system built upon an acceptance of Biblical inerrancy has collapsed because its foundations have proved unsound : the Anglo-Catholic's formal system always lacked infallible guarantees, while its foundation of apostolic succession and its appeal to primitive use have been in vain. *The Protestant is left with one way open to him; to discard the pursuit of religious truth by the method of Formal Logic and openly to adopt the scientific method of the logic of real knowing.* Liberal theologians are now doing so without qualms. The editor of the *Modern Churchman* writes (*Modern Churchman*, vol. xxxii, p. 159), quoting the *dictum* of a professor of Natural Science :

"We regard evolution as the best working hypothesis for our research. We are always ready to exchange it for a better working hypo-

thesis should that present itself, or to modify it in the light of new data."

'That is, I believe, the right and effective way of presenting our great Christian dogmas to the modern world—not as *mere* hypotheses, but as the best *working* hypothesis for human acceptance and practice.'

Professor C. E. Raven writes in his lectures, *Science, Religion, and the Future* (p. 67):

'The measuring-rod of a man is sufficiently accurate for the human craftsman and engineer, even if its records are no longer ultimately exact. What has happened is that probability here as in other fields takes the place of certainty; laws become hypotheses and infallibilities disappear for science as they ought to have done for theology.'

The hypotheses and postulates of a scientific theology will be verified by their value for the good life. Theology will become not a depository of fossilized dogma but a living science, not the guardian of the Faith expressed once and for all but the generator of religious progress. It will whole-heartedly embrace the text, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' It will welcome new truth and therefore be the formulation of the religion of the spirit; it will foster re-union because it will judge all ecclesiastical orders and ordinances by their fruits; it will ask the world to accept Christianity as the true and final religion, not because it is formally compelling judged by logical proofs, but because it satisfies men's deepest religious needs and accepts no temporal or local formulation as the final expression of eternal truths.

In the last century men learnt that change is real; they learnt how to deal with a world which, including man himself, they know is changing. It is our task to apply this new method in the realm of the spirit. Hence Theology must become a science employing the scientific method adapted to its own *data*. There will always remain a large multitude who crave for a spiritual certainty where they may escape all the trials, troubles and tension which the advance of the spirit costs. For them the Roman Church will continue to provide; and beneath its formal certainties they will find rest, while their piety and devotion will, alas! be exploited by men who hide their desire for power over others by loyalty to an institution. Other Communions can never compete with the prestige and priest-craft of Rome in providing such satisfactions which she derives from an unbroken tradition and age-long experience. If Europe denies the claims of the Spirit and prefers the comforts of servitude, the powers of Rome will grow. But for those who see life as a quest of the Spirit, religion will not be denied those intellectual methods which have so successfully brought man's environment under his control and indeed cannot be denied if man is to make himself master of himself.

## LUKE OF THE ANDAMANS

By Lieut.-Colonel H. M. DOUGLAS, C.S.I., C.I.E.,  
sometime Chief Commissioner of the Andamans and Nicobars.

THE Andaman Islands, in the Bay of Bengal, are in reality the summits of a submarine range of volcanoes, extending from the South of Burma. The Andamanese are the mythological monkey-people, who opposed the Aryans when they invaded India. The name is derived from Hanuman, the monkey god of the Hindus, and a hero of the epic, Ramayan.

These pigmy negritos represent the oldest races on earth. Their antiquity on these islands is proved by the refuse heaps of their kitchens, often fifteen feet in height, with fossilized shells at the base. Their religion consists of a fear of the evil spirits of the wood, the sea, disease, and of their ancestors. Every child has had a prior existence. A later child is named after a dead one, as the spirit of the latter has passed to the former.

In their characteristics, they remain children for the whole of their lives. They do not count, nor can they be taught to cultivate. It did not occur to them to turn a turtle on its back, though this is their favourite food; nor to catch a fish by hook and line. Within the tribe, the herd instinct prevails; children after six do not remain with their parents. Yet they can distinguish Orion and other constellations, and know the Milky Way as the Way of the Angels!

Some few years ago, as the result of early missionary enterprise, there remained in Port Blair, the headquarters of the convict settlement, the last of the converts, by name Luke. A feature of the Administration is the Andaman Home, an asylum where the Tribes are welcomed, fed and cared for. In return, they collect edible bird's-nests, tortoise-shell, and other local products, the income thus derived being expended on them.

Visitors to the Home in 1915 would have been received by Luke, the superintendent in charge. Should the capture of a turtle be desired, there was one at hand in a tank; two Andamanese would dive into the water and capture it. It was then offered for sale, or restored to the tank for a future 'turn.' If rupees were offered Andamanese would shoot at them with arrows, at thirty yards range, with amazing success; or a dance would be organized, the men dancing, while the women sat in a circle and applauded, a unique variation.

Luke's manner was reserved and courteous, but detached, even disinterested; he seemed always to be looking beyond you. Some attributed this attitude to the savage, striving to find expres-

sion behind a semi-civilized exterior. Others saw signs of a dual personality, coupled with haunting reminiscences of his Christian training, conscience distributing memory. He had drifted back to his own people, and realised the cost.

Whatever the cause, there was something in the manner of this primeval negrito which baffled explanation. He was a law unto himself. Either as an Andamanese or a Christian, he was entitled to one wife. In his dual capacity, he acquired three. Proceedings might have been instituted by either side, but nothing was done.

Then Luke fell sick of pleurisy. An officer called to see him, and unwisely commented on his enfeebled condition. In order to prove the contrary, Luke jumped up and drew his bow. Internal hæmorrhage resulted in his death.

On Armistice day, sports were in progress on the *maidan* of the settlement. British and Indian soldiers, military police, Andamanese with their bows and arrows, were all engaged in various competitions. The Chief Commissioner was presiding, and was suddenly made aware of a movement in the crowd.

In the distance, a small truck was seen approaching, pushed by convicts, and guarded by two Sikh policemen. As it passed, the crowd maintained a respectful silence, and it was realised that these were the mortal remains of Luke, on the way to the Christian cemetery, adjoining the *maidan*.

At the wicket gate stood the chaplain in his surplice, awaiting the arrival of the truck. There were no mourners, for Luke's relations were heathen.

The band ceased to play; the sports were suspended. The Chief Commissioner and his civil officers fell in behind the bier. The British soldier has been called, by the local inhabitants of more than one quarter of the globe, 'the English gentleman.' His views concerning coloured persons are at times characteristic; but an Andaman negrito was, like *Pithecanthropus*, beyond the range of his vocabulary.

Without fail, however, numbers volunteered as Luke's pall bearers. In the presence of some four thousand silent onlookers, representing most of the religions of the East, Hindus, Moslems, Parsees, Buddhists, and Animists of various degrees, the procession slowly made its way up the hill.

The chaplain proceeded with the service. In the pervading stillness his words carried far, including the familiar sentence, 'to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother here departed.' They would realise that 'our brother' meant Luke, the negrito . . . A Burman convict was deputed to shape a head-stone for Luke's grave. With the artistry of his race, he carved thereon an unstrung Andaman bow.

As the convict band continued the jazz programme, and the sports were resumed, a parting ray from the setting sun glanced over the hill. As if by design, it lit up the burnished metal of a British cruiser, and the sombre wood-work of a Chinese junk — types two thousand and more years apart — lying side by side in the sapphire waters of the harbour.

Next morning, a Sikh magistrate called on the Chief Commissioner. He was a typical specimen of his race, with regular features, olive complexion, and parted beard; he was arrayed in white, excepting the conventional strip of colour on the forehead under the voluminous puggerie. His forbears had all been soldiers; but as he had shown exceptional brilliance, and taken a degree, it had been decided, with some hesitation, that he should wield the pen rather than the sword for the Sirkar (State). He had joined the Civil Service, in which men of his class were readily received.

‘Huzur’ (Your Honour), he said, ‘that incident of Luke’s funeral was the subject of prolonged discussion last night by officials and others of different creeds. We realised that this black negrito, of low origin, and to many of us an untouchable, had been given a funeral with distinction such as befitted a British officer, because he was a Christian. I, thus, have altered my views regarding the Christian religion. It has always seemed to me a mere formality, since Christians attend their church or not as they please. Also in my Punjab district, I have seen at least four missionaries preaching different kinds of Christianity. Huzur (Sir), what is this Christianity?’

‘I appreciate your difficulties, Sirdar,’ said the Chief Commissioner. ‘Christianity is in its infancy; it has yet to find itself and achieve Unity, which is a matter of time. It is best represented by what is known as the Sermon on the Mount, found in the Gospel of St. Matthew. The founder of Christianity gave no thought to complex doctrines, or ceremonies, but recognized as His disciples those who endeavoured to live the life set forth in this sermon. One of your Pundits once said to me that “we shall reach a further stage, and shall realise that there is neither Christian nor Sikh, Hindu nor Moslem. We are all pilgrims on the same quest — the attainment of infinite perfection, the realization of our soul, and Oneness with Brahm or God.” That Preacher was contemplating the common origin of all religions. In any case, Sirdar, if you will consider that sermon, you will appreciate Christianity as a Religion.’

The Sirdar bowed, and said, ‘Ruksat?’ (May I go?). The Chief Commissioner nodded, and the Sikh left the room.

## LEPROSY, BIBLICAL AND MEDIAEVAL

By the Rev. JOHN TODD, M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Waterstock, Oxford.

OF all the diseases which have afflicted mankind none has been regarded with more dread, none with more loathing than leprosy. The very word 'leper' has come to denote an outcast, and 'leprosy' to be used as a synonym for sin. Joinville, in his *Memoirs of S. Louis of France*, relates that the king once asked him whether he would rather be a leper or commit a mortal sin. 'Sire,' replied the Seneschal with more truth than tact, 'I would rather commit thirty mortal sins than be a leper.' Most of us draw our ideas of leprosy from the Bible and, from our earliest years, Sunday School lessons, picture books and sermons have portrayed vividly the conditions and misfortunes of the lepers. It will come therefore as no small surprise to many to learn that there is in the light of modern medical science no such thing as leprosy in the Bible. The cases of leprosy described in the Bible are not the horrible disease known as leprosy in mediaeval and modern times, and it is surprising not only that the mistake ever arose, but that it still persists so widely among Bible readers to-day.

The detailed description of leprosy is found in *Leviticus* xiii. But no one reading that chapter, if the word leprosy were not used in it, would associate the symptoms described therein with leprosy, for the symptoms described simply do not tally with leprosy. On the other hand, the most characteristic features of leprosy—the hideous facial deformity, the thickening of the nose, lips and ears, the loss of eyelashes and eyebrows, the mutilations of the limbs, the loss of feeling in parts of the body, the raucous voice, every one of these characteristics is omitted in *Leviticus* xiii.

Furthermore, if the priest were not sure whether the man had contracted this disease, he was directed to examine the patient at intervals of seven days, and to notice whether the disease had made any progress. But leprosy is one of the slowest of all diseases to develop, and frequently no change can be detected for years. To examine a leper after such a short interval as seven days with a view to noticing whether the disease had progressed would be ridiculous.

Again, the Biblical disease is evidently curable, for the regulations in *Leviticus* xiv describe the rites to be performed and the sacrifices to be offered when the leper is restored to the community. 'And the priest shall look, and behold, if the plague of

leprosy be healed in the leper . . . ' But leprosy is one of the most intractable diseases, and, although in recent years cases have been cured, it was, until the other day, incurable.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, the word *lepra* was not the word which Greek physicians applied to leprosy. The Hebrew word is *tsâra'ath*. When the Hebrew Bible was translated into Greek (the Septuagint) the word *tsâra'ath* was translated by *lepra*. Consequently, if we know the meaning of *lepra*, we know also the meaning of *tsâra'ath*. But *lepra* was the word used by Greek physicians for a well-known skin disease. Thus Hippocrates writes of 'lichens and leprae' being easily curable, and the Greek physicians Oribasius, Aëtius, Paul of Aegina and Actuarius all write of *lepra* as a circular, superficial, scaly eruption of the skin, *i.e.* the comparatively mild skin disease which to-day we call *psoriasis*. On the other hand, when Greek physicians wrote of leprosy they called it not *lepra* but *elephantiasis*, the 'elephant disease,' either because it was the 'great' disease, as the elephant is the great animal, or because the patient's skin resembled the hide of an elephant. Indeed, the Greek physician Aretaeus, a younger contemporary of S. Luke, gives a description of *elephantiasis* which might have been written in a modern leper hospital. It is certain therefore that the Biblical disease was not leprosy.

Can we go further and say more exactly what biblical 'leprosy' was? This is difficult, for the term evidently covered more than one skin disease, for, whilst one part of the description clearly points to *psoriasis*, another part clearly implies *leukoderma*, or, as it is sometimes called, *vittiligo*.<sup>2</sup> This latter is a skin disease in which the parts of the body affected turn white and is by no means rare amongst negroes. Neither *psoriasis* nor *leukoderma* is dangerous or contagious and both are easily curable. In *Leviticus* xiii.30 the 'leprosy of the head or of the beard' is ringworm, a contagious disease common amongst the poorer Jews and Moslems to-day. A new revision of the Old Testament is long overdue and it is to be hoped that when a revision is made, the word leprosy will be discarded.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In 1597 A.D. Christian Lewingstoun was accused of witchcraft. One of the charges against her was that 'scho affermit that scho culd hail Leprosie . . . quhilk the maist expert men in medicine are not abil to do.' She was strangled at the stake on Castle Hill, Edinburgh, and her body burnt. Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials in Scotland*, Vol. II, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> Arnobius (a pagan professor of rhetoric who was converted to Christianity early in the fourth century) uses the word *vittiligo* for leprosy in describing our Lord's miracles. *Contra Gentiles*, Bk. I, § 8.

<sup>3</sup> It is difficult to find a suitable word to take its place. Perhaps the anglicised word *tsâra'ath* might be suggested, with the marginal reading 'a curable skin disease.'

But the feature of the so-called leprosy which strikes the imagination most is the segregation of the leper.

'And the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent and his head bare and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip and shall say Unclean, Unclean. All the days wherein the plague shall be in him, he shall be defiled; he is unclean; he shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be' (*Lev. xiii, 45, 46*).

Some writers have pointed to this regulation as an example of the wonderfully advanced sanitary institutions and of the hygienic knowledge displayed by the Mosaic law. In point of fact it is nothing of the sort, for the segregation was not made for sanitary or for hygienic reasons. Neither *psoriasis* nor *leukoderma* is contagious, nor is it at all likely that the ancient Hebrews had grasped the idea of the spread of disease by contagion. That the segregation was not made for hygienic reasons is proved by the rabbinic regulation that a bridegroom, if he thought that he was suffering from the disease on the day of his marriage, need not report for examination until seven days after his marriage. Would such a delay have been allowed if the Jews had regarded the disease as contagious? Furthermore, a non-Israelite who was living amongst the Jews and developed the disease was not segregated. Would this have been allowed if the segregation had been for hygienic reasons? The segregation had nothing whatever to do with sanitation or hygiene; the man was banished from his fellows because he was regarded as ritually or ceremonially unclean. Every Israelite who is said to have suffered from leprosy received the leprosy as a punishment for some sin. Miriam was smitten with leprosy because she uttered disrespectful words against God's chosen servant, Moses. Gehazi, the servant of Elisha, was smitten for his hypocritical covetousness and King Uzziah for his usurpation of priestly privileges. Leprosy, indeed, was regarded as the divine stroke. Hence it was only natural that the people, by *à posteriori* reasoning, should look upon persons afflicted with leprosy as sinners.<sup>4</sup> They must have violated the laws of God. Their transgression must be great or they would not have been so afflicted. Their presence in the community was therefore dangerous, and it would bring down the wrath of God upon the community unless they were expelled. Therefore, not for the sanitary safety, but for the moral safety of the community they were expelled.

But it will be asked, If the biblical disease is not true leprosy, how comes it that the confusion between the two diseases arose?

<sup>4</sup> Similarly the Persians thought that anyone who suffered from 'leprosy' (i.e. from *psoriasis* or from *leukoderma*) must have sinned against the sun (*Herodotus*, Bk. I, 139).

The answer is perfectly clear. As already pointed out, the Greek word for leprosy is *elephantiasis*, i.e. the elephant disease. But the Arabs also had a disease which they called *da al-fil*, the elephant disease. This disease is the swollen leg, the Barbadoes leg as it is sometimes called, that is, the disease which we call *elephantiasis* to-day, but which was apparently unknown to the Greeks. Thus Greeks and Arabs used the same name for two entirely different diseases. When, therefore, Greek medical books were translated into Arabic, it was obviously impossible for the Arabs to call leprosy 'the elephant disease' as they already employed that term for another disease. Consequently the Arabs used the term *judham* to denote leprosy and kept the term *da alfil*, or elephant disease, for the swollen leg. This was the beginning of the confusion. But worse was to come. In the early Middle Ages Arabic medical books were translated into Latin, and the Latin translators rendered the Arabic word *judham* by *lepra*. Thus *lepra* got into the Latin translations as the equivalent of the Arabic *judham* and of the Greek *elephantiasis*. These Latin translations helped to stereotype the medical nomenclature, and hence *lepra* lost its original meaning of a curable skin disease and came to be regarded as the equivalent of the *elephantiasis* of the Greeks, that is as the equivalent of true leprosy.<sup>5</sup>

When did leprosy make its appearance in Europe? It would seem to have been a comparatively late arrival, for Hippocrates,

<sup>5</sup> We can, indeed, detect the mistake actually in process of being made in the writings of Constantinus Africanus. For Constantinus Africanus see Rashdall's *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, Vol. I, p. 80. Chaucer refers to him in the *Prologue*, l. 434, and in the *Merchant's Tale*, l. 1810. C. V. Daremberg, the great French medical historian, proposed that a statue should be erected to Constantinus either at Salerno or at Monte Cassino. Constantine the African, whom Rashdall calls 'one of those misty characters in the history of mediaeval culture whom a reputation for profound knowledge and Oriental travel has surrounded with a halo of half-legendary romance,' settled at Salerno, the seat of medical learning, about 1060 A.D., and a few years later became a monk in the great Benedictine Abbey of Monte Cassino. There he translated Arabic medical works into Latin. One of his translations, dealing with leprosy, is named *De Elephantia*, but half a dozen lines farther on, instead of the word *elephantia*, he uses the word *lepra*! '*Ex his enim humoribus corruptis nascitur infirmitas quae lepra solet nuncupari*' (Constantini Africani Medici, *De Elephantia*, Liber I, p. 322 in the edition printed at Basle in 1541). Thus Constantinus Africanus, whose medical writings were in common use in mediaeval Europe, helped to transfer the term *lepra* from a harmless skin disease to the horrible disease which the Greeks had known as *elephantiasis*. The word *elephantuosus*, meaning a leper, is found as late as the twelfth century in the Durham chronicler Gaufridus de Coldingham. He tells how Bishop Pudsey built Sherburn Hospital and placed there the *elephantuosi* in his diocese. '*... et elephantuosos in episcopatu suo circumquaque collectos, ibidem instituit.*' *Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres* (Surtees Society, 1839), p. 11.

the Father of Medicine who died c. 370 B.C., knew nothing of leprosy. The earliest account of the disease was written by the physician Straton in the third century B.C. and comes from Egypt. Lucretius also regarded Egypt as the source of leprosy.

'There is the elephant disease whose origin is in mid Egypt by the streams of the Nile and nowhere else.'<sup>6</sup>

Apparently leprosy made its way from Egypt to Syria, and was brought into Italy in 61 B.C. by the soldiers of Pompey returning from their Syrian campaign, as Pliny says it was not found in Italy before the days of Pompey. 'On the evidence of silence,' writes Sir Clifford Albutt, 'we may guess that *elephantiasis* did not appear in Italy until about the time of Themison and Celsus' (first century B.C.). Slowly the disease spread through Europe, but if it reached England before the Norman Conquest it must have been extremely rare. True, there is a reference to it in Wales, for in 92 A.D. the great Welsh king, Howel the Good, decreed that if a woman left her husband on account of his being a leper, she was entitled to full restitution and sole possession of all her goods (Haddan & Stubbs, vol. i, p. 249).

But the oldest hospital in England of which we have any record, S. Peter's, founded at York by King Athelstan in 936 A.D., made no provision for lepers, and there is no reference to lepers in Thorpe's *Collection of Anglo-Saxon Laws*. On the other hand, there is no truth in the statement of the old seventeenth century historian, Thomas Fuller, that the disease was brought into England in the twelfth century by Crusaders who returned from the Holy Land, for although the twelfth century saw a great increase in leprosy in England, the disease must have been here before the days of the First Crusade as Archbishop Lanfranc built a leper-house at Harbledown, Canterbury, in 1084, and the First Crusade did not leave England until 1096. Many leper-houses were founded in the twelfth century, S. Giles-in-the-Fields, S. James', Westminster (now S. James' Palace), S. Bartholomew's, Oxford, S. Mary Magdalen, Ripon, and the great leper-hospital of Sherburn, Durham. Sherburn was founded in 1181 by Hugh Pudsey, Bishop of Durham, and the most elaborate provision was made for the lepers, for, although disobedience and laziness were to be punished with the rod '*per ferulam modo scholarium*,' regulations about the food were given in great detail. On S. Cuthbert's Day the inmates were to have *salmones recentes* (fresh salmon), and on days when fresh fish could not be had *allecia rubea*

<sup>6</sup> Est elephas morbus, qui propter flumina Nili

Gignitur Aegypto in media, neque praeterea usquam. *De R.N.*, vi, 1114.

<sup>7</sup> *Greek Medicine in Rome*, p. 282.

(red herrings) were to be provided, and it was specially enjoined that nothing putrid or corrupt, or that had died of disease was to be served to the lepers. This last regulation contrasts favourably with a statute, no doubt kindly meant, of the Scottish Parliament passed under King Robert III in 1386.

'Gif ony man brings to the markit corrupt swine or salmond to be sauld, they shall be taken by the Bailies and incontinent without ony question, sall be sent to the lepperfolke, and gif there be no lepperfolke, they sall be destroyed alluterlie.'<sup>8</sup>

Why did the leper evoke such compassion in the Middle Ages? We do not find the same compassion shown, say, to the mentally afflicted. Why did this particular disease draw to itself a devotion which was not only exaggerated but distinctly morbid? There would appear to be two reasons for the unique place which the leper occupied amongst the afflicted in mediaeval days. In the first place there was a belief amongst the Jewish rabbis that the Messiah, when he came, would be a leper. This belief was based on the words in Isaiah liii.4 :

'Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted.'

'It is with reference to this passage,' writes Dr. Edersheim (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i, p. 488), that the Messiah bears in the Talmud the designation '*The Leprous One*.' Nor is it altogether surprising that the early Christians also based their ideas of the personal appearance of our Saviour on this same passage. Justin Martyr, for example, writing in the middle of the second century, said that our Lord appeared without beauty, Clement of Alexandria described Him as unlovely in the flesh and base in aspect, and Tertullian wrote that His body was devoid of human beauty. This tradition about our Lord's personal appearance culminated in Jerome who, when he translated the Scriptures into Latin in the last quarter of the fourth century, translated Isaiah's words 'We esteemed him stricken' by '*Nos putavimus eum quasi leprosum*,' 'We esteemed him as it were a leper,' and these words remain in the Vulgate to this day. Throughout the Middle Ages they were read in this Latin translation, and as no one doubted that they applied to our Lord, is it surprising that leprosy was regarded with a reverence which was not given to other diseases?

The second reason for this special devotion to the leper sprang from a strange confusion between Lazarus of Bethany, brother of Mary and Martha and friend of Jesus (*John xi*), and Lazarus

<sup>8</sup>Skene's '*Regiam Magestam*.' *The Auld Lawes and Constitutions of Scotland* (edit. 1774), p. 414.

in the parable of 'The Rich Man and Lazarus' (*Luke* xvi.19). Gradually this Lazarus of the parable, because he was described as 'full of sores,' came to be regarded as a leper, and then, by a strange confusion, was identified with Lazarus of Bethany and called S. Lazarus! Finally he became the patron saint of lepers. Hence houses for lepers were named 'lazar-houses' and 'lazar-ettos,' and lepers themselves were known as lazars. Even an Order of Chivalry, the Knights of S. Lazarus, was founded c. 1113 A.D. for the special care of lepers; and this Order, introduced into England in King Stephen's reign, fixed its headquarters at Burton Lazars in Leicestershire.\*

Thus, as a result of a double mistake, a halo of sanctity, even morbid sentimentality surrounded the mediaeval leper and gave rise to the name *Pauperes Christi*, Christ's Poor. Kings and lords, noble ladies and bishops sought to win heaven by ministering to them, by washing their feet, even by kissing their sores. The Good Queen Maud, wife of Henry I, is recorded to have gathered lepers together, washed and kissed their feet and, when rebuked by her brother, who said that the king would not like to see his queen kissing the feet of lepers, she replied: 'Who does not know that the feet of the Eternal King are to be preferred to the lips of a mortal king?' The devotion to the lepers which Hugh, the saintly Bishop of Lincoln, displayed, has been vividly told by his chaplain Adam, afterwards Abbot of Eynsham.

He describes their swollen and livid faces, deformed and sanious, with eyelids averted and eyeballs dug out, with lips wasted and faces which it was impossible to touch or even to look at afar off. The chaplain tells how S. Hugh embraced them and kissed them, and, overcome by the horror of what he is describing, writes 'O Good Jesus, spare the unhappy soul of him who relates these things.'

In the fourteenth century, however, a strange change took place. The leper, far from being the object of religious devotion, became an object of moral aversion. There were two reasons for this. In the first place, it is certain that not all which passed for leprosy in the Middle Ages was really leprosy, and there can be no doubt that many who were regarded as lepers owed their disease to their own immoral lives. Perhaps the increase in leprosy in the twelfth century was really an increase in a disease due to the evil living of the Norman conquerors (*lepra Normanorum*). Certainly the wording of the order made by Edward III in 1346, commanding all lepers to withdraw from London, leaves

\* It is said that the Master of the Order had himself always to be a leper until Pope Innocent IV abrogated this rule. But apart from the improbability, the evidence for such a strange regulation is late and untrustworthy; and the Bull abrogating the rule is probably a forgery.

no doubt that the disease from which some were suffering was venereal.<sup>10</sup>

In the second place the lepers in the fourteenth century fell under suspicion (of course without the slightest foundation) of poisoning the supplies of drinking water at the instigation of the Saracens. As a result of this slander Philip V of France caused many lepers suspected of this crime to be burned in 1320,<sup>11</sup> as did also Charles VI in 1388. Anthony Wood relates that :

‘ Edward II would have restored the old leper-hospital of S. Bartholomew, Oxford, had it not been for this serious accusation against the lepers who were “upon shrewd suspicion of the fact in England utterly hated and their hospitals brought for the most part to great decay” ’ (*City of Oxford*, Vol. II, p. 509).

Although the regulations about lepers in the Book of Leviticus were unintelligible to the Mediaeval Church the regulation which ordered the segregation of the lepers was strictly carried out, and the writ *de leproso amovendo* authorized the removal of the leper from the society of his fellows. The leper could neither plead in court nor claim an inheritance nor make a will. In fact, to all intents and purposes he was a dead man, and this was emphasized by the *Office for the Seclusion of a Leper*.

‘ The leper was brought into the church and there he knelt under a canopy of black cloth “after the manner of a dead man” to hear Mass. After the Mass the priest cast earth upon his feet, saying: “Be thou dead to the world, but alive again unto God,” and leading him forth from the church to the dwelling prepared for him, the priest chanted the *Libera me, Domine*, that is, the responsory sung after the Mass of the dead. Arrived at the hut where the leper was to dwell, the priest read to him ten prohibitions, amongst other things forbidding him to enter a church<sup>12</sup> or to go into a market or to go out without his leper’s garb or to speak to anyone unless he were on the leeward side. He then gave to him a few necessary articles including a “cop and clapper,” the former for alms and the latter to give notice of his approach.’

The law was stern, and although well-defined tests for leprosy were used by mediaeval physicians, some lepers doubtless escaped expulsion whilst, in other cases, some unfortunate men and women, through faulty diagnosis, were expelled without just cause. One case has come down to us which is well worth quoting for the light it throws on the procedure.

<sup>10</sup> A full translation of the king’s order will be found in H. T. Riley’s *Memorials of London in the 13th, 14th and 15th Centuries*, p. 230.

<sup>11</sup> ‘*Hoc anno leprosi quasi per totam Christianitatem fuere diffamati, quod inissent foedus cum Saracenis ad intoxicandum Christianos . . . multi de Provincia et Francia convicti combusti sunt.*’ *Chronicle of Thomas of Walsingham*, Rolls Series, p. 158.

<sup>12</sup> It ought not to be necessary to say that a low-side window is not a ‘leper window,’ nor has it anything to do with lepers, but this idea still persists and is sometimes found even among clergy.

In 1468 an accusation of leprosy was brought against Johanna Nightyngale of Brentwood, Essex. She appealed to the king, Edward IV, who on July 3rd issued a chancery warrant for her examination, and the physicians William Hatteclyff, Roger Marschall and Dominic de Serg were appointed to examine her.

‘Edward by the Grace of God, King of England and France and Lord of Ireland, to the Sheriff of Essex, greeting. Whereas we have heard that Johanna Nightyngale is a leper and is commonly holding intercourse with people of the aforesaid county, and mixes with them both in public and in private places, and refuses to retire to a solitary place as is customary and befitting her, to the grievous injury and, on account of the contagion of the aforesaid disease, to the manifest perils of the aforesaid inhabitants, We, willing to guard against such dangers, as far as in us lies, and as is just and customary in such cases, do charge you, that having taken with you certain discreet and loyal men of the county of the aforesaid Johanna, in order to obtain a better knowledge of this disease, You go to the aforesaid Johanna and cause her to be diligently viewed and examined in the presence of the aforesaid men. And if you find her to be leprous, as was reported of her, that you cause her to be removed in as decent a manner as possible from all intercourse with other persons, and have her betake herself immediately to a secluded place as is the custom, lest by common intercourse of this kind, injury or danger should in any wise happen to the aforesaid inhabitants. Witness my hand at Westminster this third day of July in the eighth year of our reign.’

On November 1st the physicians made their report to the king and certified that Johanna was not leprous, and in these days of ‘doctor’s certificates’ it is not without interest to note that this is the earliest medical certificate that has come down to us.<sup>13</sup>

What was the cause of the disappearance of leprosy in England? It used to be said that it disappeared because people gave up eating fish after the Reformation! Such a theory is hardly worth discussing, for it was the fifteenth century, and not the Reformation century, which saw the disappearance of leprosy. With more probability it is said that leprosy disappeared because the standard of living was raised in the fifteenth century. It is true that the fifteenth century saw a rise in the standard of living, and, as leprosy is a tubercular disease, it would tend to disappear where living improves. But is there evidence that the standard of living in the fifteenth century was raised to an extent sufficient to account for the disappearance of this disease? This is doubtful. What, however, is certain is that this scourge of mediaeval Europe had not only vastly declined, but to all intents and purposes had disappeared in England by the end of the fifteenth century.

<sup>13</sup> The Latin text is in Rymer’s *Foedera*, Vol. V, Pt. 2, p. 166.

# GERMAN WAR-GUILT AND CHRISTIAN FORGIVENESS

By THE EDITOR.

LORD Vansittart, in his *Lessons of my Life*,<sup>1</sup> regards the question 'Ought we to forgive the Germans?' as one of supreme importance and on the answer to which not only the future welfare of mankind but even the survival of the Christian Religion depends. Lord Vansittart writes as a distinguished diplomatist whose foresight and courage have earned the respect and the gratitude of his countrymen. In his treatment of his theme, he criticizes, condemns and rejects with intense conviction the utterances of various Christian publicists which, if put into practice, he is convinced, would produce most disastrous results both for civilization and for the Christian Religion.

Pre-eminent among these champions of Christian sentimentalists was Dick Sheppard, with his 'heart of gold and head of feathers.' He has passed from us, loved and mourned by many: but his disastrous pacifism still survives and inspires the utterances of many lesser men. These men whose utterances fill Lord Vansittart with apprehension seem to him to be advocating, in the name of the Christian Religion, a sentimental conciliation and misguided appeasement as the only right post-war policy towards Germany. Lord Vansittart writes:

'Can we forgive Germany? . . . '

'We obviously cannot forgive *this* Germany; our every leader and spokesman has pledged us to make an utter and abiding end of it. Such an end is a necessity, because, among other reasons, any revival of German militarism is incompatible with any survival of Christianity. *This* German generation is admittedly incurable . . . A new and retaught generation will have to replace the incurables. *We* must perforce leave open the date of safety. Our successors alone can decide. In other words, *we* cannot, even if we would, forgive. All that we can do is to make the way of forgiveness as secure as possible' (pp. 164-5).

It is extremely important, in what we hope is the closing period of our Second World-War, that we should not repeat the well-intentioned blunders which marked our peace policy in the years which followed the First World-War. It is also very important that all men of good will in our Christian Empire should be united in the peace policy they advocate. After all we have suffered together, and all we have striven to achieve by united action in a great cause, such unity in our peace policy ought not to be impossible. But to secure it demands preliminary agreement in our answers to two fundamental questions which are closely interwoven:

- (1) What is Christian forgiveness?
- (2) Can this Christian forgiveness be granted to the Germans?

<sup>1</sup> *Lessons of My Life*, by Lord Vansittart. (Hutchinson. 1943. 9/6.)

I.

*What is Christian forgiveness?* In the Christian Religion, Divine forgiveness is taught with a moral and spiritual profundity and authority not found in any other of the world's great religions. In the Bible, God—the source of all goodness—is presented pre-eminently as the Forgiver of Sin. 'To forgive is His *métier*'—if the acute but somewhat irreverent phrase of a French writer may be pardoned. God's method of forgiveness is the pattern for Man's forgiveness of his fellow-man.

But there are, we have to acknowledge, two doctrines of Divine forgiveness in the Christian Religion. These two doctrines have their counterpart in the Religion of Israel, where they are known as the prophetic doctrine and the priestly doctrine of Divine forgiveness. They are summarized by the prophet Micah in his dramatic dialogue :

'Wherewith (asks the sinner) shall I come before the Lord? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings? . . . Shall I give him my first-born for my transgressions? (And the prophet replies to the sinner) What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justice, love kindness and walk humbly with thy God?' (*Micah vi, 6-8*).

In the Christian Religion, the teaching of Jesus Christ on Divine forgiveness is in line with that of the prophets of Israel, but His teaching is more developed. Our Lord taught an essentially moral and spiritual doctrine of forgiveness which is the very essence of His Gospel. God's forgiveness is conditional. The conditions demanded are first the repentance of the offender. This repentance consists of (a) sincere sorrow for the wrong done; (b) the sincere resolve not to repeat the offence; (c) a sincere desire to make reparation for the injury committed, if this be possible. The second condition demanded is that the sinner seeking Divine forgiveness shall practise forgiveness of his fellow-man. This he must do, prompted not by self-interest which would make his forgiveness a commercial transaction intended to benefit himself, and so merely superficial, mechanical and non-moral, but a forgiveness of his fellows prompted by love of God as man's moral ideal and by sincere love of his fellow-man.

Hence loyalty to the two Great Commandments of the Christian Religion is the source of Man's right forgiveness of his fellow-man. Just as God's forgiveness of man operates solely so as to make the man forgiven a better man, so Man's forgiveness of his fellow-man must be of such a kind as to have the same aim and effect. Any other kind of forgiveness condones evil, makes the forgiver an accomplice in the sin of him whom he forgives, and does an injury to the man forgiven. This is Christ's doctrine of forgiveness. We see it taught in the Parables of the Prodigal Son, and of the Pharisee and the Publican, where stress is laid on true repentance. We see it taught in the Lord's Prayer and in the

Parable of the Unmerciful Servant, where stress is laid on the need for Man to forgive his fellows if he would receive the forgiveness of God. We see it in the words of Jesus spoken of the conscience-stricken woman who wept over His feet: 'Because she loved much, her sins which are many are forgiven.' Where the spirit of love reigns in the offender, his sin, however great it is, becomes forgiveable. The highest point reached in the teaching of Jesus about forgiveness is seen in His exhortation that those who are wronged should pray for the Divine forgiveness of those who wrong them.

The other doctrine of Christian forgiveness to which we have referred corresponds to the priestly doctrine of forgiveness in the Old Testament. It originated with the attempt by the primitive Christian Church so to explain the crucifixion of Jesus as to remove it from being pointed to by the Jews and others in such a way as to stultify any claim that might be made for Jesus as the Christ. The primitive Church, influenced largely by Old Testament oracles (especially *Isaiah* liii) presented the death of Jesus as a vicarious sacrifice offered by Him to the Divine Father for the forgiveness of the sins of mankind. Everyone who had faith in this atoning sacrifice for sin secured by his faith the forgiveness of his own sins. This sacrificial doctrine of Divine forgiveness was not put forward by the primitive Christian Church in contradiction to the teaching of Jesus about forgiveness, but as additional to it. However, it was inevitable that this supplementary doctrine, appealing so strongly to the sacrificial instinct in man which created the sacrificial systems in all primitive religions, should not only supplement and even obscure the primal teaching of Jesus, but by supplementing it, replace it.

This priestly doctrine of Divine forgiveness became, if not the source, at least the strength of the Church's sacramental system by which the New Testament sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper were made instrumental for the forgiveness of the sins of those who became recipients of these sacraments. In the primitive Church, not only was there Baptism for the living but also for the dead (*I Cor.* xv, 29), by which the departed were relieved from their sins. At a later period the Lord's Supper in the form of Masses for the dead was celebrated as an expiatory sacrifice for the remission of the sins of Christian souls in purgatory. But with this sacrificial doctrine of Divine forgiveness in the Christian Religion we have no concern here. Honesty demanded that we should refer to it, since it has had an extraordinary influence on the teaching and practice of the Christian Church, although it had not the authority of the Founder of the Christian Religion behind it. It is the prophetic doctrine of Divine forgiveness as taught by Jesus which is what this world needs at the pre-

ent time and which is able to make a universal appeal morally and spiritually, not only to modern Christians, but also to vast multitudes who are not adherents of the Christian religion.

## II.

*Can this Christian forgiveness be granted to the Germans?* When, therefore, we have in mind the forgiveness of the Germans we mean the prophetic Christian doctrine of forgiveness as taught by Jesus. This demands as conditions of forgiveness repentance of the wrong done; resolution not to repeat the wrong; reparation for the wrong done as far as it is possible by the wrong-doer. It means also the forgiveness of others by those forgiven and a desire to live henceforth in neighbourly love with them. When we have convincing proof that this represents the moral and spiritual condition of the soul of the German people, they are entitled to forgiveness and we as Christians must forgive them.

Here there is unhappily need for extreme caution by our nation. We are not a revengeful people but are prone to forgive and forget, not because we are eminently Christian, but because we find it easier to do so and optimistically hope that by such forgiveness good relations will be established. By such forgiveness in the past we have condoned bad behaviour and have even encouraged it, and have done moral harm to those whom we have forgiven so easily. We see this to be true of our policy between the First and Second World-Wars. Our too ready forgiveness of Germany then did grievous injustice to France and to the small nations by which Germany is surrounded. We shut our eyes to the German flagrant breaches of the Treaty of Versailles because it would have cost us much money, effort and moral courage to have compelled the observance of the terms of that Treaty. But we had no comfortable feeling all the time that we were prompted by the spirit of forgiveness.

The Germans were not won to kindly feeling for us by our forgiveness of them. They did not forgive us since they regarded us as the real cause of their defeat and humiliation. England was for them 'the enemy.' We doubt if any kindness on our part could have altered their feelings. Have we any sound reason to believe that after defeat in the Second World-War our ready and unconditional forgiveness of them will alter their feelings towards us? We wish with all our heart—and this is not hypocrisy—that it might be so: but before we can believe it we must have the strongest evidence. Edmund Burke said he did not know how to indict a whole nation. Quite so. There are many individuals in the nation who abhor the nation's crimes; but in practical politics we cannot act upon this.

The Lord would have spared Sodom had ten righteous men

been found in it. Can we forgive Germany because of the minority in the German nation who abhor Hitler and his atrocities? Hitler declared that he had to conquer Germany before he could conquer the world; and he performed the first conquest so effectively by means of purges and concentration camps that he secured national unity behind his militarist policy. It may be said, 'You forget the protests of the Confessional Churches and that some 700 of their pastors are languishing in prison because of their opposition to Hitler.' We wish to be just. Did the Confessional Churches oppose Hitler's militarist policy? Did they protest against his invasion of Poland and his occupation of Denmark, Norway, Holland and Belgium? We cannot recall that they did so. Their quarrel with Hitler arose out of certain German Church issues and the interference of the Nazi State with the freedom of the Confessional Churches to protest against the fundamentals of the Nazi religion of Blood and Soil. Their attitude to Hitler was not so servile as that of the Vatican to Mussolini when it blessed the invasion of Abyssinia and the invasion of Albania, and the sending of Italian troops to aid Franco in the overthrow of the Liberal Spanish Government. Never, so far as we know, did the German Confessional Churches utter any united and unflinching protest against Hitler's war policy which was destined to deluge the world in blood. Such is the prestige and power of the militarist tradition in Germany, such is the loyalty of the German people to their leaders—a national characteristic noted by Tacitus in his *Germania*—that it becomes impossible from the point of view of practical politics to treat Germany politically except as a unity. Only when we have a new ruling class in Germany with a new ideology can we rightly and safely forgive the German people and restore them to their former position in the comity of the nations of which their ruthless militarism has deprived them. To do this requires a long process of re-education which cannot be without tears.

In thinking of German re-education, we must realize at the very outset the educational value of the public and unflinching execution of justice on those who have outraged all standards of civilized conduct. After that it may be possible to manifest

'A tenderness behind the law,  
A sweetness following on the awe.'

This may seem to some a most un-Christian policy. If it should so seem, we believe it to be due to a radical misconception of the true nature of Christian forgiveness inspired by love for God and Man. The Christian Church in this country—which supported the Peace Pledge movement and induced Germany to believe that in no cause where love, justice, freedom and the rights of man were trampled under foot would England take up arms to oppose the tyrant—must bear its share of blame for the Second World-

War. It can best make reparation now by denouncing conciliatory pacificism, and also by teaching in the clearest manner the true nature of Divine forgiveness and the terms on which alone that forgiveness can be granted to the Germans.

It is not within our sphere to deal with the political terms of peace with Germany on which our statesmen must insist. Sir Alfred Zimmern has taught his readers to realize the amazing and detrimental blunders of which ecclesiastics have been guilty when, ignorant of the real political situation but inspired by high motives and visions of the ideal, they have offered public advice to statesmen in the sphere of international politics. In *The Times* of August 22, 1944, Mr. Quintin Hogg, M.P. for Oxford, with no little courage for a politician, calls public attention to a recent flagrant example of such detrimental interference in international politics by ecclesiastics.

SIR,—In common, I suppose, with other members of the House of Commons, I have received the enclosed documents purporting to be sent officially on behalf of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of St. Andrews and including a manifesto apparently signed by the whole Roman hierarchy in Scotland. In the documents the hierarchy, while 'trusting in Almighty God' that Polish-Russian conversations may lead to a just settlement, 'point out in no uncertain way' that they 'must not remain silent if the sovereign rights of the Polish nation are to be filched from them either by undue pressure or by open violence on the part of another State.'

The Archbishop has directed his secretary to inquire of members of the House of Commons 'whether or not you are prepared to stand by Britain's pledge to defend against aggression the free and independent State of Poland.' He adds: 'I enclose herewith stamped addressed envelope and shall be glad to have the favour of an early reply.' In other words we are being asked to state in writing to the Roman Catholic Archbishop whether or not as members of the House of Commons we will in certain circumstances be prepared to declare war on our greatest ally.

Yours, etc., QUINTIN HOGG.

As Christians we are primarily concerned with Christian moral and spiritual education for the whole human race as the most important factor in world betterment. In the approaching post-war period, the Christian Church in this country, when it has set its own moral and spiritual house in order, can contribute its share to the moral and spiritual re-education of the German people. Here there will be much scope for the more attractive and winning side of Christian love to exercise itself; but here also there will be much need for the restriction of the emotional side of Christian love and also much need for laying stress on its moral and spiritual character.

The German mentality—and it is a very able mentality in many spheres, as German culture and civilization prove—is not going to be either easily or quickly transformed, and least of all by sloppy sentimentalism. The German will not be quickly liber-

ated from wishful thinking, nor from the underlying conviction that somehow might is right and that the German people are entitled to a place in the sun—and that place the first—and also to a *Lebensraum* at least as spacious as that enjoyed by other Great Powers. The re-educational problem presented by Germany is fraught with tremendous difficulties. These difficulties are so great that not a few men of good will must despair of success. The policy summed up in the pregnant phrase of Cato Major, '*Delenda est Carthago*,' will seem the only sound and safe policy to some who are trustees for the future peace of the world and the progress of civilization—Germany as a political entity must be annihilated—the fate of Jewry must be the fate of Germany.

We have to say emphatically that this policy is a pagan policy and no understanding Christian can support it. We believe also that the policy is essentially unsound. We hope that the harder and more prolonged task of German educational conversion will be that which the Allies will adopt as their policy; but what courage, what wisdom, what patience this re-educational policy will demand: and if we are not extraordinarily cautious, it may fail not from lack of good-will but from inability to understand the nature of the German mentality which we are seeking to convert.

We venture to conclude with an illustration drawn from personal experience.

After the First World-War, Ripon Hall, we believe, was the first academic institution in England to enter into educational relations with a German University. A plan for the exchange of theological students between Marburg University (which had at that time a noble body of liberal professors in its Theological Faculty) was arranged with Ripon Hall. Of course the final arrangements were sanctioned by Berlin.<sup>1</sup> The first Marburg graduate arrived in Oxford. He came a month before term began at Ripon Hall, and spent the interval in the Principal's rural vicarage.

The Marburg student and his hostess got to know each other so well that they were able to discuss together the causes of the First World-War. She maintained that at the very outset Germany had lost the war *morally* by invading Belgium in defiance of all treaty obligations. The Marburg student in many subsequent discussions could not agree with this. At last, shortly before leaving for Ripon Hall, he said to his hostess: 'I see it now. Germany was wrong. When she invaded Belgium she made a great mistake.' His hostess was delighted with this confession. He then continued: 'We ought not to have gone through Belgium: we ought to have gone through Switzerland.'

But it is not fair to close the narrative at this point. After a year, the Marburg student returned to Germany. He was ordained and married a wife with strong Nazi convictions. He wrote to his former Principal: 'If you could realize it, it is almost impossible for any young man or young woman in Germany not to become a Nazi nowadays.' He, however, did not become a Nazi but remained a Liberal. When Nazism finally got on top he left Germany for the Far East as a Christian missionary.

<sup>1</sup> Some years later, when the Hitler *régime* dismissed those liberal professors of Marburg who would not support the Nazi policy, Ripon Hall, after sending a memorial to Berlin, broke off the exchange of students.

## A ZIONIST'S INTERPRETATION OF CHRISTIANITY

By the Rev. P. GARDNER-SMITH, B.D., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge.

DR. Klausner, the author of *From Jesus to Paul*,<sup>1</sup> is a Russian Jew who studied at Heidelberg, held various academic posts at Odessa, and in 1920 went to Palestine, where he now holds a professorship of Modern Hebrew Language and Literature at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Some years ago he published a book translated under the title *Jesus of Nazareth*, a book which represented a study of the Gospels from a point of view less sympathetic than that of various liberal Jewish scholars who have written in the last thirty years. Now he follows up his earlier work with a study of the beginnings of the Christian Church and of the life and work of St. Paul, whom he regards as the real founder of historic Christianity. 'Jesus alone does not explain the rise of Christianity as a new community.' 'Jesus considered himself to be the Messiah, and by means of the repentance and the morality which he preached in Jewish cities he expected to bring redemption to Israel; but Jesus never intended to found a new religion and spread it among the Gentiles.' It was the Hellenistic Jew, Paul, who turned a movement within Judaism into a world Church.

The work is divided into seven Books. First, we are given a sketch of Judaism outside Palestine in the first century, since without the Diaspora there could never have been a Christian Church. Dr. Klausner admits that from the point of view of Palestinian strictness the Jews of the Dispersion left much to be desired, but he explains this by insisting that they were not rooted in their own soil, and a Jew can never be a really satisfactory Jew except in Palestine. This undercurrent of Zionist propaganda runs through the book. Dr. Klausner is deeply convinced that Judaism is essentially a national and spiritual force, and one of his main charges against Christianity is that it betrayed Judaism by dropping the national aspirations of the Jews. Religion in the Jewish sense is not merely a matter of ethics, or even of what Christians call 'religion'; it involves a world-view and an all-embracing hope of history, according to which the day will dawn when the politico-spiritual Messianic ideal of Israel will be realized in all its fulness, the Jewish people will dwell in their historic national land, and the Gentiles will accept the teaching of Judaism as it is found in the *Torah* and the Prophets. In other words, there is to be a

<sup>1</sup> *From Jesus to Paul*, by Joseph Klausner, Ph.D. (Allen & Unwin Ltd. ; 15s.)

world-wide Jewish state with its centre in Jerusalem. Dr. Klausner's preoccupation with such dreams explains his hostility to purely spiritual religion, but his book will do little to commend to others the cause he has at heart. Indeed, it might provide a good deal of material for anti-Semitic propaganda.

To return to the Jews of the *Diaspora*, it is one of the regrettable facts of history that the liberal Judaism of the Hellenistic age disappeared and left hardly a trace, being swamped by the narrow nationalistic Judaism of later times.<sup>1</sup> But Dr. Klausner does not regret its disappearance, for he has little good to say of the Jews of the Dispersion. He regards them as an unreliable class, proselytes in many cases, tolerant of mere Godfearers, and so unable to resist the dangerous propaganda of Saul of Tarsus. That is the first point; 'Paul and his Christianity were built out of the ruins of the uprooted Judaism of the *Diaspora*.'

In Book II the author reviews the pagan world at the time of the rise of Christianity. Here, in discussing pagan philosophy, Dr. Klausner gives his attention too exclusively to Stoicism. Posidonius of Apamea, Seneca, and Epictetus, from all of whom he quotes at length, were doubtless influential in certain circles towards the end of the first century; but other philosophical schools did exist, and the influence of Plato was deeper and more enduring than that of the Stoics. It can hardly be maintained that St. Paul made his converts among the Stoics, and the resemblance of some of his teaching to that of Seneca is only superficial. Epictetus wrote after St. Paul's death.

More to the purpose is the chapter on religious syncretism, which presents a fair account of the atmosphere in which the Pauline churches grew. The number of philosophers in the cities of Asia was limited, but there were innumerable worshippers of the ancient gods and of their more modern rivals; and although the early converts to Christianity were more often attached to the synagogues than to the heathen temples, the New Testament itself witnesses to the influence of heathenism upon many Christian congregations. Nevertheless, exaggeration of the influence of paganism upon the growth of Christianity is as easy as it is dangerous. It suits Dr. Klausner's case to describe the facile deification of kings and emperors in the first century and then to conclude, 'In a similar way Christianity later represented Jesus to itself.' Historically there is no parallel. The emperors were men supposed to have been raised to a place among the immortals on account of

<sup>1</sup> 'We see the picture of a most fearful catastrophe. The entire rich culture of Hellenistic Judaism had been systematically annihilated, with terrible consequences. The Judaism of the Talmud killed its Greek-speaking sister' (Lietzmann, *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*, p. 95).

their achievements on earth; Jesus was acclaimed by the Church the pre-existent Son of God, the incarnate Logos through whom God had made the world. Partial parallels to the Church's Christology may be found, but not in emperor-worship. Similarly with regard to the Resurrection; pagan cults told of gods dying and coming to life again, but does Dr. Klausner contend that it was the influence of these cults that led the first disciples, Galilean Jews as they were, to proclaim Jesus risen from the dead?

In general, Dr. Klausner's contention is that, whereas the religion of Jesus was Judaism (though even in his teaching was embodied the germ of the negation of the ceremonial laws), Christianity became a pagan mystery religion, which retained only such elements of Judaism as were acceptable to the heathen world. If such a transformation did take place, it would seem vastly improbable that its agent could have been Saul of Tarsus, a Hebrew of Hebrews, a Pharisee, a pupil of Gamaliel, one who outstripped his contemporaries both in zeal for his inherited traditions and in hostility to the followers of Jesus. Whatever else he was, Paul was a Jew, steeped in the literature of the Old Testament, and utterly opposed to pagan ways of thought. No doubt St. Paul was born in Cilicia and not in Judaea, perhaps he was always more liberal in his views than the nationalists of Jerusalem (although of that there is little evidence); but not all the Jews of the *Diaspora* were half-heathen, and Saul had a rigorous training in the Holy City.

Book III deals with Hellenistic thought, the Wisdom of Solomon, 4 Maccabees, the Sibylline Oracles, and Philo. Here perhaps the author wastes a good deal of space, and he himself seems to feel that the long account of the Sibylline Oracles, for which he has an unbounded admiration, is not strictly relevant to his theme. His object is to shew that Judaism had a message for the world as good as, and indeed better than the Christian Gospel; so, after describing the Sibyl's denunciation of heathen immorality and her promise of peace in the days of the Messiah, he concludes: 'This likewise was the preaching method of early Christianity in the days of Paul and his associates.' How far the comparison is justified may be judged by those who study even the extracts from the Oracles printed in this book.

Philo does not win our author's unstinted commendation, being too deeply tinged with Hellenism. Yet the Christians spoiled even Philo: 'Little by little Christianity corporealized and coarsened the conception of the Philonic Logos and made of it the second person of the Trinity, the Son-God, the Man-God.' Dr. Klausner's exposition of Philo is unquestionably valuable, but how far the learned Alexandrian or the tendencies which flowered in him in-

fluenced the *early* development of Christian theology, 'from Jesus to Paul,' we may be permitted to doubt.

Book IV contains an examination of 'the sources,' the *Acts* and Pauline Epistles. In some forty pages Dr. Klausner shews himself well versed in modern literary criticism, and it is to be noted that his views are generally conservative. For instance, he accepts the Lucan authorship of *Acts* and the genuineness of *Ephesians* and *II Thessalonians*, and although he 'senses in the Pastoral Epistles a time later than the time of Paul,' he declares that there is no mathematical certainty even about this conclusion.

In Book V, Dr. Klausner proceeds to an examination of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, and he begins with the question, 'Why was there any Christianity at all?' Jesus claimed to be the Messiah and was crucified. Other Messiahs arose in that troubled age, were slain, and forgotten. How can we explain the fact that Jesus was not forgotten? Our author is surely right in pointing to the belief in the Resurrection as the most potent factor in securing the survival of the Christian movement, but he is strangely out of touch with the most recent modern criticism when, following Celsus, he ascribes this belief to the testimony of Mary Magdalene, 'a woman hysterical to the point of madness.' This may be in accordance with the developed tradition of the latest of the gospels, but it is clear beyond dispute that in establishing the resurrection faith the testimony of Mary and the other women as to the Empty Tomb was secondary to the disciples' own experiences. Dr. Klausner supports his assumption with a florid passage from Renan, but he would have been wiser to consult works of more recent criticism.

Needless to say, the Resurrection is explained as due to the sensitive imagination of certain disciples, and to make this explanation plausible it is necessary to allow that Jesus made a deep impression upon the minds of his followers. This leads Dr. Klausner to give a brief summary of the beliefs about Jesus in the earliest Church. So far as it goes this summary is fair enough, and it is to be noted that the author rejects such sceptical criticism as that of Guignebert and Bultmann. Within limits he is an honest historian, and he sees that great movements presuppose great causes; but whether he himself provides explanations adequate or convincing is a question which his readers must determine for themselves. What he will not allow is that Jesus himself delivered a single word with intent to found a new religion or a new religious community. Many Christian scholars will agree; but the attitude of the Jews and the logic of history made the emergence of such a community inevitable, and the Christians, taking account of the new fact of Jesus, were compelled to modify and expand the theology of Judaism.

A chapter is devoted to the work of 'Simon Cephas-Peter,' enthusiastic, warm-hearted, credulous and fickle, of whom, as the opponent of Paul, Dr. Klausner expresses a qualified approval. Then follows a brief account of the primitive Church in Jerusalem, on the essentially Jewish character of which Dr. Klausner is careful to insist. Not until Hellenistic Christians began to emerge was there any serious trouble with the Jewish authorities, and the first spilling of Christian blood was the work of a hostile and fanatical mob who were roused to fury by Stephen's unfamiliar criticism of the institutions of Judaism. The murder of the Protomartyr was not the work of the Sanhedrin, since by Talmudic rule Stephen was no blasphemer. However, it was this incident which led to the great innovation of preaching to Samaritans and Godfearers among the Gentiles, an innovation clearly contrary to the express command of Jesus, 'Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans.' *Matt. x, 5* may be called Dr. Klausner's favourite text, and he quotes it several times in support of his contention that the foundation of a world-wide Church was an actual infringement of the command of Jesus. Since he attaches so much weight to the saying he should at least have considered the possibilities discussed in any modern commentary on the First Gospel. The saying may not be authentic, but an insertion into the teaching of Jesus by the narrowest sect of Jewish Christians, part of that strongly Jewish source of which the editor of the Gospel made occasional use. In any case, the saying was intended by the editor to apply only to the days of the Ministry, when, according to his view, the time for the extension of the Gospel had not come, for, as Dr. Klausner is very well aware, the same Gospel contains the final charge of Jesus, 'Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations.' It is arbitrary criticism to accept one saying which happens to fit the author's own convictions and to ignore the other.

Dr. Klausner's habit of selecting isolated texts which suit his purpose, to the exclusion of other less welcome passages, is one of the worst features of his book. It is all very well to quote *Matt. v, 17-18*, but an impartial commentator would surely balance this ultra-Jewish saying against other passages which tell in the opposite direction. Jesus certainly criticized the food laws which are fundamental to Judaism, and Dr. Klausner would not deny the genuineness of the comprehensive saying about old wine and new bottles. An unprejudiced reader of the Gospels with the Sermon on the Mount before him could hardly suggest that the demand for a righteousness exceeding that of the Scribes and Pharisees implied greater *ceremonial* strictness in the entrants to the Kingdom of Heaven; yet that is the implication of Dr.

Klausner's statement on p. 297 :

'It was quickly felt that if the new faith did not wish to remain only a small Jewish sect, it would have to make its righteousness *less* than the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, and not *more*.'

This, according to our author, was the main reason for the abandonment of Jewish ceremonialism, particularly by the unprincipled and designing Apostle to the Gentiles. Dr. Klausner is convinced that Jesus, and still more his followers, abandoned the ceremonial law, not because the Spirit of God had revealed something better, but because they shrank from the labour of conformity themselves and despaired of imposing it upon others.

Very soon the abrogation of the Law became a settled policy with the Church, and Dr. Klausner ascribes this fact to various unworthy motives. For instance, on p. 299 he seriously suggests that the Christians, who abandoned the Law in order to entice the Gentiles, did so because at the end of the period of the Second Temple the fortunes of the Jews were sinking lower and lower.

'Gentiles in general, and Romans in particular, at that time felt scorn and contempt for the Jews and Judaism. The powerful of the earth were Gentiles and not Jews. . . . It was necessary therefore to depart more and more from the Jewish Messianic idea, to transform the Jewish Messiah into a pagan saviour, to compromise more and more with the Gentiles and the Roman Empire in particular . . . , to make all sorts of exemptions and lightening of requirements for Gentiles and Gentilism. These things the general situation of those days required.'

Such a passage betrays the familiar Jewish inferiority complex, and it shakes our faith in Dr. Klausner as an historian. The history of the persecutions hardly suggests a policy of easy accommodation with the Empire, and the idea that the early Christians regarded their growing Church as a business proposition, in which the contemptible Jews could be disregarded since they were in no position to contribute to its success, is too fantastic to need further comment.

In Book VI Dr. Klausner approaches at last the life and work of Saul of Tarsus. It is a curious experience to find oneself transported into the atmosphere of the *Épistle to the Galatians*. One is often tempted to regard that letter as being very much 'dated,' since the controversy with which it deals belongs to the forgotten past. Dr. Klausner's chapters provide a living commentary on St. Paul's indignant outburst. He makes precisely the same charges as were made by the Judaizers long ago. The Galatians were told that Paul was a disloyal Jew, a subordinate minister of the Gospel who had been untrue to his commission, a shift time-server with no settled convictions of his own but a very keen eye to the main chance, ready to make any concession to the Gentiles if he thought that by so doing he could gain a few more worthless converts. Dr.

Klausner's opinion is very similar. At the end of his book he makes a few grudging concessions and admits that Paul had some characteristics worthy of admiration; but for the most part he does not attempt to conceal his detestation of 'Saul-Paul.' He was only a Hellenistic Jew at the best, and his training in Jerusalem did no more than impose a veneer. Converted by his vision ('a psychological phenomenon which is found among dreamers and visionaries, such as we saw in the "resurrection story" which was woven around the crucified Jesus by Mary Magdalene and the rest of Jesus' disciples, something like the "visions" of the Mormons in our time'), Paul, epileptic, a sickly man, a thorough melancholiac, yet 'lacking in humility, exceedingly confident in himself, and boastfully condescending, set about his task of creating a new religion. Probably

'Ananias was the one who explained to him that there was hope for the new faith to win converts from the Gentile Godfearers if only they did not have to bear the heavy yoke of the ceremonial laws. There is, he may have said, a multitude of *women* in Damascus who have become proselytes. Why? Because baptism is all that is required of them. Hence, if we do not demand circumcision of the Gentile men either . . . greater and greater will be the number of proselytes who can be Jews and disciples of Jesus at the same time.'

Yet

'Barnabas was the first to clarify for Paul an idea of which Paul had been dimly aware even before; namely, that circumcision and the observance of the rest of the ceremonial laws should not be demanded of Gentiles believing in Jesus.'

Opposition came from James, who complained that the *true* believers in Jesus can only be those who have been Jews from the beginning, according to the words of Jesus to His disciples, 'Go not into any way of the Gentiles, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' So Barnabas was sent by the Jerusalem Church to Antioch to rebuke the innovators. But alas! being tolerant and fickle, like Peter, he was satisfied with little. He became interested in the mission to Gentiles and did not investigate them closely with regard to the strict observance of the ceremonial laws. Thus he prepared the way for Saul, the only man fit to transform Christianity from a Jewish sect into a world religion. It will be found a profitable exercise to read a few chapters of the *Acts* and see how much of this is dependent upon St. Luke and how much upon Dr. Klausner's imagination.

Dr. Klausner's account of the Missionary journeys does not call for special notice, although some of his readings of the text are surprising. Thus Mark accompanied Saul and Barnabas as their 'interpreter,' though why these two Hellenists should have required a Jerusalem Jew as interpreter is not apparent, and the

word used in *Acts* xiii, 5 (*ὑπηρέτης*) means 'servant' or 'minister.' Paul 'had some success owing to his clever schemes and all the concessions he made.' 'He rejoiced with them that did rejoice and wept with them that wept; he was a diplomatic politician who knew how to adapt himself to any situation; he strove to please all men in all things.' Above all, he was careful to conceal the political significance of Jewish Messianism—to the Jews fundamental. The attempt of the author of *Acts* and of the Evangelists and of Paul himself to make out that the Gentiles in general and the Roman officials in particular were friendly to Christianity, and only the Jews persecuted it, is dishonest and explicable only by the fact that it was more convenient for the Nazarenes to lay the blame for persecution upon the weak Jews than to hold guilty the powerful Romans and Greeks; besides, it was easier to persuade Gentiles to adopt a mystical and irrational faith in a dying and rising 'saviour' than to persuade Jews. Yet, somewhat inconsistently Dr. Klausner admits that the Jews had more reason than the Gentiles to oppose the Pauline teaching,

'since to them it was a denial of political redemption, a belief in "the curse of God that was hanged," and an abrogation of the *Torah* and ritual laws. Therefore the opposition of the Jews was more bitter.'

Which is just what the New Testament says, but here as so often Dr. Klausner wants to have it both ways.

A Polish Jew remarked recently that 'Paul was our misfortune.' Dr. Klausner would certainly agree, though he might use a stronger word, for he is quite incapable of being fair to the Apostle to the Gentiles. Thus, he hints that the collection for the poor at Jerusalem, to which St. Paul devoted so much of his energy, was intended as a bribe to conciliate the Jewish leaders of the Jerusalem community. At any rate, it 'inclined the hearts of those leaders unconsciously toward Paul and Barnabas and their opinions, and towards the Gentiles and their customs. Men are weak—even men who observe Jewish ritual law . . .' (p. 365).

Accepting the Lucan account of the Council of Jerusalem (*Acts* xv), Dr. Klausner considers the decree to represent a compromise, since it yielded to the Gentiles on most of the ceremonial requirements, but *not on all*; and to Jews who had become believers in Jesus it yielded nothing. For that reason it was ignored by Paul, who immediately after the Council set aside all ceremonial requirements, from circumcision down, for both Jews and Gentiles.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Klausner seems to be at sea concerning the Apostolic Decree. He writes (p. 368): 'James concluded that Gentiles baptized into Christianity should observe something like "the seven rules of the sons of Noah"; they should avoid idolatry, adultery, and murder, the three offences which according to Jewish law come under the rule of "let him suffer death or not trans-

On the whole Dr. Klausner inclines to conservative criticism, but he is not above a high-handed subjectivity when it suits his purpose, and sentences introduced with the words 'Of course' must be taken with caution. Thus in discussing *Acts* xvi, 6-10, where we read that the Holy Spirit prevented St. Paul from preaching in Asia and Bithynia, Dr. Klausner writes, 'Of course, the true reason was that information reached Paul that his opponents among the Jews or Gentiles of Asia and Bithynia were very numerous and powerful.' Yet St. Paul had never visited those districts. The Apostle was successful in Europe 'enticing women, because they were not subject to circumcision,'<sup>3</sup> and presenting his 'gospel' as a 'bait' to catch a few disloyal Jews. Dr. Klausner has scrutinized the Lucan narrative with the object of seizing on any incident which can be turned to the discredit of the Apostle, but it is strange that he did not see that his ungenerous suggestion that St. Paul avoided Ephesus on his final journey (*Acts* xx, 16) because he was afraid for his own safety is disproved in his very next sentence, 'He spoke to the elders at Miletus of the danger awaiting him in Jerusalem.' Then why was he going there?

The further Dr. Klausner proceeds, the more arbitrary does he become in his treatment of the narrative. On *Acts* xxiii, 12-35, he writes:

'Paul had a suspicion—probably groundless—that there were fanatics among the Jewish group<sup>4</sup> who wished to fall upon him and kill him or beat him when he should be brought before the Sanhedrin for a continuation of his trial.'

What right has our author to say that the suspicion was 'probably groundless'? The chiliarch was a better judge, and he took the matter very seriously indeed. Nor is Dr. Klausner to be trusted in other cases. Typical is the following passage on the *Personality of Paul*:

'He made a whole series of concessions and compromises whereby he succeeded in finding favour with the Roman government, with strong-minded slave-owners, with domineering husbands, and with compromizers

gress." In addition to these three rules, Gentiles who had accepted Christianity were required to do three other things not so understandable to Gentiles: they were to abstain from the meat of animals not slaughtered according to ritual rules, from blood as a food, and from the meat of animals that had been sacrificed to idols.' So Dr. Klausner reads the decree in both senses, moral and ritual. He adds: 'I am using the wording of *Acts* xv, 20, according to the *Eastern* text, and not according to the *Western* text which expunges the three latter things and substitutes the "Golden Rule" of Jesus.' Textual critics must make what they can of that.

<sup>3</sup> And the rest of the Law?

<sup>4</sup> What 'Jewish group'? Is it hinted that they were Christians?

and appeasers of the usual sort. Who knows if this did not bring about not only the rapid acceptance of Christianity, but also its rapid degeneration? How remote is all this from the sayings of Jesus that he had come not to give peace on earth, but rather division, and that he had come to cast fire upon the earth, and how he wished that it were already kindled! Ethical extremism is an outstanding characteristic of the teaching of Jesus: in the Epistles of Paul ethical compromise and adaptation to reality go hand in hand with extremism in religious belief.' 'Paul was therefore a clever politician, and he was far from being a saint, particularly in the Christian sense of the word. Actual saints frequent places of prayer and live in monasteries, but they do not organize and administer sects and congregations and churches.'

In plain language, this is nonsense.

Dr. Klausner is utterly unable to understand St. Paul, and his animosity against one whom he regards as a renegade Jew leads him into many absurdities, particularly in Book VII, on *The Teaching of Paul*. Thus we are assured that Paul, ignored by Jesus, whom he had almost certainly known in the flesh, a foreigner, an outsider among the apostles, unpaid and unregarded, sought to compensate for his feeling of inferiority by the creation of a heavenly Messiah in whose service he would appear no less, and perhaps even more an apostle than Peter. He might even be more important than James, the brother of Jesus. So he refused to know Jesus after the flesh, and substituted the Lord of the living and the dead, the judge on the Day of Judgment, the abrogator of the *Torah*, redeeming mankind with his own blood.

'Not once does Paul call Jesus "son of man," the reason being that for Paul "Jesus Christ" is not a man even in the most exalted sense, but a heavenly figure. Thus it is but a step from this spiritual and heavenly Messiah to complete equality with deity, as in the later doctrine of the Trinity.'

Religion cannot flourish without ceremonial laws, so Paul, having abrogated the *Torah*, gave the Church the sacraments, for it was he who imparted to baptism and the fellowship meal an altogether un-Jewish significance. Baptism he regarded in a non-Jewish fashion, and of the eucharist he made a mystery, something like the communion between the pagan initiate and the body of the god to whom he was consecrated.

Dr. Klausner's chapter on *Faith in Christ* is painful reading. Not only does he fail to understand the Pauline doctrine of salvation by faith, but he does not try. He can only conceive of 'faith' as belief in dogmas, and so on p. 596 he writes, 'While Paul freed believers in Jesus from the chains of prescribed rules, he fastened them up again in the chains of even harder dogmas.' Granted that St. Paul did compose a noble poem on love, yet even here he exaggerated. 'He spoke so much of Christian love, which in truth is only Jewish love with a mystical colour-

ing, that he forgot to emphasize righteousness.' 'If prophecies shall fail and knowledge shall vanish away there will be no place for righteousness and justice for which prophecy strives, and no place for truth for which knowledge strives.' 'The wonderful triad, faith, hope, and love, comes from a Greek source'; but the true fruit of St. Paul's labours is to be found in the immoral Gnostic sects of the next century (p. 595).

---

We may be told that Dr. Klausner has written 'an important book.' Admittedly he has devoted vast labour and no small scholarly equipment to his task, and some of his notes drawn from the treasury of rabbinic lore are illuminating. But the general effect of his book is to emphasize the great gulf which still exists between Judaism and even the most liberal Christianity. In the words of the Apostle, 'Unto this day, whensoever Moses is read, a veil lieth upon their heart.' To the enlightenment of the twentieth century the ceremonial law of Judaism appears as a strange survival of ancient and irrational taboos, historically interesting, but religiously irrelevant. That is because the Christian Church has given to the world a conception of religion widely different from that of Judaism. Conservative Jews, still living in the atmosphere of two thousand years ago, still blending religion with politics, still confusing the great with the small, and still preoccupied with nationalist aspirations, are as unwilling as they are unable to appreciate a purely spiritual religion, or to conceive of a free and spontaneous righteousness which has transcended the law of ordinances, and has risen to a height of moral achievement in which St. Paul saw the fruit of the indwelling Spirit of God. Nationalism is at the root of the trouble.

'If Judaism had listened to the voice of Paul, it would have disappeared from the world, both as a religion and as a nation. But Judaism wished to endure as a religion, in order that in the course of time the pure ethical monotheism and the ethico-social Messianism of the prophets might prevail; and it wished to endure as a nation, in order that it might again be free upon its own soil to create there politico-national and economic-cultural values as do other nations. Judaism is *not only a religion, but a nation as well*. Hence if it should surrender its characteristic religious faith, its nationality would also die' (p. 593).

That is the point, and it explains why to Dr. Klausner a universalistic and 'mystical' Christianity is as incomprehensive as it is offensive. 'My deepest conviction is this,' writes Dr. Klausner, 'Judaism will never become reconciled with Christianity.' He is right; and so is St. Paul, 'Whensoever it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away.'

## PROBLEMS OF POST-WAR HOUSING

By the REV. CHARLES JENKINSON, M.A., LL.B., Vicar of Belle Isle, Leeds,  
Deputy-Chairman of Leeds Corporation Reconstruction Committee.

**I**N post-war reconstruction the provision of housing accommodation must occupy a leading place, for the urgency of the situation, and the general concern, will not permit any Government to neglect the question. Tens of thousands of families are homeless by reason of the total destruction of their dwellings by enemy action; a vast number of young couples, married during the war, have never had either house or home; and clearly these hundreds of thousands of people must be provided for as speedily as possible. Then some two hundred thousand houses which were scheduled for slum clearance over eleven years ago are still standing and inhabited<sup>1</sup>; and overcrowding remains a major and almost untouched problem.<sup>2</sup>

The Ministry of Health's opinion that 3,000,000—4,000,000 new dwellings will be required under these four headings will, I think, prove a fair guess, at the higher figure. But it must not be thought that the twelve years or thereabouts during which the Government hope to see that number of dwellings erected will see the end of our housing requirements. The scope and magnitude of the projected programme, as it is carried out, will inevitably necessitate further advances—and the foundation of planning in

<sup>1</sup> These will involve far more than 200,000 families. In the County of London, for example, at the last census, only 37 per cent. of the families occupied a structurally separate dwelling (house or flat), and 32 per cent. of the families were living *three* or more families in one house.

<sup>2</sup> At the outbreak of the war there were 200,000 declared cases of legal overcrowding unrelieved. But that figure only dimly indicates the real overcrowding which exists. Whilst the standard of accommodation now in force registered a great advance by establishing that a dwelling is overcrowded when the number of persons normally sleeping in it 'is such that any two of those persons being ten years old or more of opposite sexes, and not being persons living together as husband and wife, must sleep in the same room,' and by laying it down that the total number of persons in a dwelling must be further regulated by the sizes of the rooms, the standard is a very poor one because *not bedrooms only but every living-room in a dwelling* has also to be reckoned as available for sleeping purposes. Real overcrowding exists wherever there is not a sufficient number of *bedrooms* for any given family. The difference that exists between the legal standard of overcrowding and real overcrowding was demonstrated by Leeds in 1935, when the Overcrowding Census was made throughout the country. No other city, so far as I am aware, arranged its census similarly, but Leeds obtained figures for real as well as for legal overcrowding. 72,569 houses were measured and surveyed: on the legal standard, 2,345 (3.27 per cent.) were overcrowded; on the same standard applied as a bedroom standard, 15,127 (21.12 per cent.) were overcrowded.

our large towns and cities should be the preparation for such advances. At the conclusion of the announced housing programme something like half the population of the country would be left in pre-1914 dwellings, most of which, by that time, will be hopelessly obsolete in the light of the standards established by the new dwellings; and there is, I think, little doubt that they will have to be replaced. The old belief that a house is a fit habitation so long as its walls will stand up is happily rapidly dying, and is not likely to survive another 4,000,000 new houses. But better machinery for securing the replacement of worn-out or obsolete housing is needed than at present exists. The most satisfactory and fair method would be to license all dwellings, new and old, for a 'life' of a stated number of years, the length of the 'life' of any dwelling to be determined by the quality of the structure and the standard of the amenities. At the expiration of the 'life,' the value of the structure, as distinct from the site, would be *nil*, further use would be prohibited, and demolition, and the re-development of the site, would follow.

But whatever machinery is devised to secure it, our housing objective seems clear. It should be the provision, through a long distance, co-ordinated and continuing programme of planning and housing, of a dwelling of modern standards of amenity for every family in the country.

That we are on the eve of a considerable advance in housing standards so far as interior amenities are concerned is certain, since the Government is initiating such an advance in the 'temporary' steel bungalow, the 'Portal' house. No dwelling has been more discussed than this experiment or expedient, but, whatever one may think of the precise policy being pursued, there is, I think, no doubt that the erection of hundreds of thousands of such bungalows will prove a landmark in our housing history, and for two reasons.

The first is that the kitchen equipment and the built-in bedroom fittings render obsolete, in those respects, practically all existing 'working' class houses, and for that matter nearly all 'middle' class houses. The second reason is that if such equipment and fittings are to be provided in 'temporary' dwellings, clearly a lower standard in such respects cannot be permitted in the 'permanent' houses which are to be erected simultaneously and subsequently. A new and advanced standard will have been firmly established, and in my opinion that is the one merit of the bungalow.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> There is undoubtedly an enormous interest amongst women in kitchen and scullery equipment and a keen desire for certain improvements. This has been evidenced in Leeds during the past month by 648,000 people visiting a 26-days Housing Exhibition largely devoted to kitchen equipment.

For while I warmly admire the standard of the amenities mentioned, I dislike the bungalow as a family dwelling. The comment which has been made that it would make a nice week-end cottage is perhaps as good a criticism as any. Beneath all defects is the fundamental one of size—the place is too small for a family to live in comfortably. This question of size has indeed hampered municipal housing enormously for many years. With the three-bedroomed non-parlour house limited to 760 square feet within its containing walls, the economical planning of interiors to suit all aspects has presented problems incapable of satisfactory solution.<sup>4</sup> Apparently the Portal bungalow is to be produced only in one model, which will have to fit all sites and face north, south, east or west, and all variants. Apart however from its size, the plan has suffered from its inception from the fact that those responsible for it—while no doubt excellent technicians in other fields of architecture—were evidently not familiar with the planning of ordinary dwellings of the type needed. The revised model has attempted to remedy some of the most glaring defects, but nothing less than a new plan and an increased floor area would, in my opinion, produce a satisfactory family dwelling.<sup>5</sup>

Nor am I enamoured of the material employed in the Portal house for the exterior (and for some of the interior fittings)—pressed steel. One consideration alone should make anyone acquainted with everyday facts avoid steel, or anything like it, for the exterior of a house, and especially for a house to be erected in some places in hundreds. What will children do when they find out, as they will in a few minutes, what an excellent drum every wall makes? And what is more nerve and temper racking than noise of that kind, to be endured in the main by the housewives?

No criticism of the Portal house simply on the ground that it is prefabricated is valid. The labour position alone obviously demands the application of pre-fabrication methods, *viz.* the making of units, often large units, in a factory, those units then being

<sup>4</sup> It is gratifying to note that the Central Advisory Housing Committee, in its report 'Design of Dwellings' (H.M. Stationery Office, 1/-), recommends a floor area of 900 sq. ft.

<sup>5</sup> It ought to be recognized, but evidently was not when the Portal house was under consideration, that the greatest volume of experience in the planning of 'working' class housing is to be found in the housing departments of the leading municipalities, the heads of which have each been responsible for tens of thousands of houses, and who are moreover in constant touch with the people living in the houses they have designed. How easy it is for architects, unfamiliar with such housing, to go astray in their planning was strikingly illustrated about two years ago in a national competition on post-war housing organized for private architects and adjudged by the Royal Institute of British Architects. The winning designs, when published, were torn to pieces in important respects by municipal architects.

brought to the site of the building, on a planned system, and rapidly fitted together to form the complete structure. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works (Mr. George Hicks, M.P.) has told the House of Commons that at the end of the war there will only be just over 300,000 men available in the building industry for all requirements, and that it will take two years to build up a force of 800,000 building trade workers, as against 1,000,000 in 1939. Clearly some methods not needing large numbers of skilled operatives, and more rapid than the traditional methods, will have to be employed if large numbers of dwellings are to be provided quickly: and pre-fabrication methods alone fulfil both requirements.

There is a not uncommon belief that a pre-fabricated dwelling cannot be as sound a building as one built by older methods, but that is not the case. Pre-fabricated structures can be bad, just as structures erected by traditional methods can be bad, if the method is inappropriate or the builder a rogue. But pre-fabricated building is, emphatically, not inferior building. On that point I write with confidence, since under my chairmanship the Leeds Corporation Housing Committee was responsible for the erection of the largest pre-fabricated concrete building built in this country prior to the war—the world-famous 23-acre Quarry Mill Flats, Leeds. The particular method there employed allows of permanent buildings of any required variety of size or design, with any desired exterior materials or colour, with cavity walling, being erected very quickly and economically; and no one inspecting Quarry Mill will question the permanence of the building. And in face of the proved efficacy of concrete pre-fabrication in this country, I cannot help thinking that if the amount of time and effort which has gone to the creation of the Portal steel bungalow had been devoted to the creation of a variety of mass-produced concrete pre-fabricated houses and dwellings, it might have been possible to avoid 'temporary' houses altogether and to have erected, very quickly, the shells of permanent houses, with at any rate the necessities installed, even if all the improved fitments had to wait a little to be added later.\*

It is, indeed, possible and in some areas probable that the 'temporary' Portal bungalow will become semi-permanent. The initial publicity for it led everyone to assume that it was to have a definite life not exceeding ten years, but in introducing on August 1st the Bill providing for its mass production, the Minister

\* The contractors who erected Quarry Mill, Messrs. Tarran Industries Ltd. of Hull, have recently erected a fully-equipped two-storey house, by an adaptation of the same method, in three days from foundation to habitation; and a bungalow in eight hours.

of Health stated that the *average* life was expected to be ten years, but 'that period might vary in individual districts and would be determined by reference to the need for the retention of the houses in the light of the housing conditions of the district. If after ten years the Portal houses were better than any other houses available, no doubt they would be permitted to remain.' That is precisely what opponents of 'temporary' housing fear: and the danger of it happening in the case of the Portal house in backward areas is a very real one, simply by reason of its fitments. In that respect, whatever its other defects, the Portal house will be superior to millions of existing houses for very many years to come.

## GUIGNEBERT'S *JESUS* \*

An exposition and criticism by the late R. W. MACAN, D.Litt.,  
Master of University College, Oxford.

THE most obvious merit of this work — judged on a single armchair perusal — appears to be the thoroughness with which the documentary evidences for the life and work of Jesus are analysed, sifted, examined, and composed: and the consequent elucidation of the extent to which after-thought, community interests and prejudices, apologetic and controversial purposes, hero-worship, and sheer mytho-poetic story-telling have affected and controlled and recreated the tradition and representation of Jesus Christ, as Prophet, and reputed Founder of the Christian Church.

Incidentally, the analysis and the argument go to show that the Christ-idea, the Christ-portrait, the Christ-personification was from the moment of 'the Resurrection' — whatever this was, or whatever it signifies — constantly emphasized, developed, rationalized or at least defended — at the expense of genuine memories of the words and acts of Jesus — which form the least, though by no means a negligible element, in the New Testament, and its apocryphal supplements.

The nett result of this *critique* seems to be to represent the Christian Religion as something with which Jesus has very little, if anything, to do — however much it may have done with Him: and its whole scheme of Salvation, and all its creeds and institutions, as pure products of the Community, reflecting and working

\* *Jesus*, by Ch. Guignebert: translated from the French by Professor S. H. Hooke. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co. 1935.)

pon an Apostolic initiative — dominated, in the first instance, by Messianic and eschatological expectations, not learnt or inherited from the Teacher, the Master, now elevated, by faith, due to the Resurrection' into the Messiah to come, to return; but adopted and adapted in the infant community, or church, in view of the Master's Messiahship, and, in course of time melting and making way for a Christology, or rather a succession of Christologies, in which the Divinization, the Apotheosis, of the Departed yet Ever-living Master and Lord was constantly enhanced, argumentatively and dialectically articulated and augmented, until the historical element in the memorial portrait had almost reached vanishing point. All that re-emerges is a bare skeleton or diagram of a Galilean Prophet arrested and put to death, at the instance of the Jewish authorities, by the Roman procurator — Pontius Pilatus, or another! — as a Messianic enthusiast, and possible danger at once to the authority of the Priests and Lawyers, and to the *pax Romana* of the political sovran.

In the process of arriving at this or some such conclusion Guignebert jettisons three quarters, if not more, of the evangelical records, as authentic evidence, and reaches a verdict of 'not-proven' on almost all the details even of the matters of fact, or naturalistic stories and anecdotes, in the Gospels. The dates, and duration, of the life of Jesus: of His birth, ministry, death, are irrecoverable. Not merely the Birth and Infancy Narratives of Matthew and Luke are pure fictions: such crises as the Baptism, the Messianic Avowal at Caesarea Philippi, the Entry into Jerusalem and pretty well all the details of the Passion, except the bare facts of arrest, crucifixion, and death, are all put down to the after-thoughts and mythical propensities of the Faithful, working on the assumed predictions of the 'Prophets' — one of the main sources of the story. The 'historicity' of Jesus is, indeed, maintained, against Drews and the ultra-Mythological School: and the historicity of some vision or visions of the Master after His death — that, with a somewhat meagre remnant of religious and moral *dicta* or *logia*, is about all that is authenticated.

The demerit of this analysis seems to underlie the method itself in its unwritten Prolegomena, or perhaps rather in its uncorrected, or unrevised, application. Every item is dealt with by itself, in isolation, on its own merits, so to say: and it is not difficult, taking each by itself, to show that they are for the most part inadequately evidenced — that this or that is not probable, at least in the form in which it is presented — that many details are undoubtedly due to after-thought, exaggeration, idealization, apologetic, argument; and that many others cannot be proved

free of these disqualifications and discredits. Now all this may be freely granted : and yet the impression made by the sum total — the weight of the testimony, not to this and that particular, but to the personality, the life drama of the Man whom the early community thus conspires to immortalize, to commemorate, to glorify, has to be reckoned with. After all, what other undoubtedly historical Person is there about whom just such a record is extant — whether remembered, or invented? And is there not an exaggeration in the assumption that nothing genuine, nothing authentic, nothing much worth mentioning, was remembered about the words and acts of the Master : of the kind of things he did : of the kind of words He used?

In particular, it is very hard to suppose that Jesus had no 'Messianic' consciousness — no 'Messianic' illusion, if you like to call it so. The very discrepancies in the stories of his Baptism might be due to interpretation of fact and feeling which went back to the Master Himself. Certainly, if the Messianic illusion was due to conversations during the Master's life, with the inner ring of disciples, it is much easier to understand the sequel. Even the revolutionary idea of a Suffering Messiah — which is one of the chief glories of Christian theology — may not have been beyond the scope of such a religious and moral genius as was Jesus. We modern Westerns are ill-equipped to understand and fathom the depths of a palmary, not to say unique, religious nature, or Son of God ! We must go to India to obtain evidence in point. Even if we go, we are still barely capable of appreciating such ecstasies, such enthusiasms, such inwardness, such *abandon*. Be that as it may, the notion that, given an Historical Jesus, he was not the colourable likeness of the Jesus of the Evangelists, is something of a paradox — an exaggeration in defect ! And again, Guignebert may not unfairly be thought to fail in his rationale of the Vision, or Visions, to which he rightly and soundly ascribes the Belief in the Resurrection of Jesus. Unless the Apostles had believed their Master to be the Messiah, while he was alive with them, it is far more difficult to account for their subjective visions — far more difficult to explain the psychological process — of self-reproach, of anguish, of debate — which might make such experiences more intelligible. And if there was no truth at all in the tradition of Peter's Messianic Salutation : no truth at all in the story of his subsequent 'Denial' : it is far harder to understand why the Visions started with Peter, or started at all. Guignebert loses a key to the Vision of Peter by cancelling its natural antecedents, as narrated, as indicated in the traditions, which need not be all pure after-thought !

Modern Spiritualism offers indeed a royal road to the Rationale of the Resurrection, that is to an explanation of the Vision-stories, so far as authentic. Guignebert does not even condescend to notice the possibilities of such a solution.

One final observation may be made, as a result of this preliminary perusal of Guignebert's book. His slighting and somewhat perfunctory reference to 'Form Criticism' of the Gospels jars on a purely disinterested reader. Surely the 'Form Critics' — Dibelius and Co. — are among his most serviceable allies or auxiliaries. What other critics have made the contribution of the Community — the effects of 'ecclesiastical' interests — the presence of After-thought — in the construction and substance of Gospels so conspicuous and undeniable as the Form Critics? True, Guignebert has been before them, apparently, in reaching similar results as the reward of his rigorous analysis: but he does not exhibit and justify the 'method' (as it seem to me) so expressly and consciously as the critics, whom he so summarily dismisses. The Form Critics have made intelligible the condition of the 'evidences' in the period between the Resurrection — the Period of Vision, of Reassurance, of Renaissance — and the greatly advanced, and rationalized, and developed Christianity or Christologies, assumed, implied, by the Gospels, in their edited and re-edited, and canonical condition. That was just one of the gaps which Guignebert leaves unbridged.

Guignebert in tracing the developing Christology of the early Church to polemical, apologetic, dialectical motives and interests emphasizes the initial disputes between Jews and Christians (Judaism and Christianity) in the first place, and Christians and Greeks (Hellenists), Christianity and Paganism, in the second place: but he seems to ignore the debate within the Church itself, between Christians and Christians, that is between the 'Pillars' of the Church, in Jerusalem, or Palestine, and the Propagandists of the Church, in Antioch, in Asia Minor, in Achaia and Macedon, perhaps in Rome itself; or as we might perhaps say, between the School of Peter, and the School of Paul. As Jesus counts for little in the birth of Christendom, so Paul counts apparently for little in its growth and development. The Tübingen tradition seems to have disappeared from the mind of the Sorbonne to-day. Perhaps a confirmation of this criticism may be found in the character of the remarkable Bibliography, which occupies pp. 540 to 553 of the book. Three hundred and seventeen items (cccxvii) are enumerated and named: and less than 10 per cent. represent scholarship and research anterior to the twentieth century. Guignebert might seem but little more indebted to the Liberal, or Modern-

ist, criticism of the nineteenth century, than to the traditional orthodoxy, or heresy, of the preceding eighteen centuries!

Having essayed a general review let there follow a study in detail, based on subsequent perusals.

At starting Guignebert propounds the purpose of the book, the title of which is simply *Jesus*. He propounds an historical problem — nay, rather a double problem — ‘the birth of the Christian religion and its establishment in the ancient world’: a double problem indeed: not to say two distinct problems. For when did the Christian religion obtain an ‘establishment in the ancient world’? Could that be dated before Constantine? From the Table of Contents it appears as though Guignebert’s horizon in this work were limited by the Apostolic Age: or at most might run into the early second century of our era. The Table of Contents rather suggests as the proper title of the work, or of the Historical Problem which it sets out to solve, ‘The Embryology and Birth of the Christian Religion’! It looks as if the problem were to determine how far the germs, the elements, the principles, of Apostolic Christianity, or of Christianity in the first century, or at most of Christianity before the rise of the great Heresies, the great Debates, could be found in the Life and Teaching of the Galilaean Jesus? Or more precisely still, what was the exact relation of the ‘Historical’ Jesus to the Christology, or Christologies, of the Early Church, in the Apostolic and Sub-apostolic periods? This question corresponds to the title of Guignebert’s ‘Introduction A,’ which is ‘The Problem of the Origins of Christianity.’

The solution of this problem is sought apparently in the interest of a present-day problem, *viz.* What is the real present, or permanent, essence, value, significance, and *raison d’être* of Christianity: upon the assumption that the answer to this present and urgent problem depends upon the answer given to ‘the previous question’ of origin.

It may be that this assumption is not to be granted off-hand. Whatever the ‘origin,’ or rather the ‘origins’ of Christianity may have been, the Christian Religion . . . by this time of day an enormously various or diversified phenomenon, or galaxy of phenomena, might be found to be, in this, in that, in the other form, or manifestation, a thing of use, of beauty, of authority or attraction, whatever its origin, and its early history may turn out to have been. It would not be easy to assign limits to the growth, adaptation, and transformation which a ‘Religion’ or which ‘Religion’ might undergo with breach of Continuity in the historic Process, albeit with indefinite modification of the ‘substance.’

Guignebert distinguished three answers to the given problem:

The traditional orthodox Answer: which he does not trouble to set forth, being as it is, obvious and familiar to everybody con-

cerned. But for the sake of more articulate apprehension we might venture to formulate it as the belief that the Christianity of the first century, and indeed of the first four, not to say six, centuries of our era, was identical with and fully contained in the religion of the New Testament, and was essentially taught and manifested by Jesus in His life-time, or as 'Catholics' might say, at least before His 'Ascension.' And that as such Christianity was, and is, essentially a supernatural, unique, unparalleled fact, or group and series of facts: historical, indeed, in as much as revealed, transacted, documented, dogmatized, and preserved in the Church and in the Bible — but not capable of being fully explained or rationalized by mere natural science, or philosophy: and therefore to be accepted, and believed, and acted upon, in virtue of the supernatural revelation, guaranteed by the Church, and the Bible. And this Answer is in substance common to Catholics and Protestants, to Reformed and Unreformed Churches.

With this traditional or orthodox Answer to the Problem Guignebert contrasts two critical Answers, which have in common the purpose to obtain, by historical methods and evidence, such an Answer to the Problem as shall substitute a more or less 'natural,' 'rational,' that is historical and scientific, solution for the traditional Answer of the Creeds and Articles. The first of these Answers was the product of research during the nineteenth century: the second has been the achievement of the scholarship and methods of the twentieth and the difference between the two is so considerable, in Guignebert's conception, that he seems to contrast and oppose the critical achievement of the twentieth century almost as sharply to that of the nineteenth as that of the twentieth to the antecedent and traditional Orthodoxy. Not but what he allows a certain continuity in the critical process and argument from century to century, and a positive and permanent value to some at least of the results of the nineteenth century critics, as well as the negative value of their destruction, or partial destruction, by the traditional orthodoxy. But I confess that, apart from the question whether Guignebert himself has failed to supplement and to correct his application of historical methods of criticism to New Testament problems, he appears to me to have done less than justice to the critical results of the nineteenth century: and I should be disposed to recognize a closer continuity, and a more homogeneous development in the whole process of modern New Testament criticism, than he appears to admit. To bring the contrast between the two, as stated by him, into prominence, we might say that the critical effort of the nineteenth century was to discover and to envisage 'the Historical Jesus,' while the effort of the

twentieth century so far has been to detect and expose 'the Celestial Christ.' According to Guignebert the former effort was a failure, and for the failure there were three reasons. (i) The methods of historical, literary, and linguistic scholarship were not fully forged and sharpened. (ii) There is not extant sufficient authentic evidence to enable the historian, or biographer, to obtain or to reconstruct a full and accurate representation of the Man, Jesus. (iii) Last, and not least, the Christology, or Christologies of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age have distorted and replaced to such an incalculable extent the authentic memories of the life, words, and works of the Historic Jesus, that the nineteenth century critics who, almost to a man, worked under the influence of a Christological prejudice unconsciously inherited from traditional orthodoxy, were disqualified from the very first, for a correct estimate of the materials on which they were working, and of the concrete or historical results, which are critically attainable.

The critics in the twentieth century have been working with much fuller evidences to hand (linguistic and archaeological): with improved methods of analysis, and of synthesis or reconstruction: and with far more adequate knowledge and conception of the complexity of the material and the 'syncretism' of the historical *data*. Thus, whereas the earlier critics treated Judaism and Hellenism in the days of Jesus and Paul as closed systems respectively, the twentieth century has been discovering to what an extraordinary extent they were mutually interpenetrated and amalgamated in Egypt, in Asia Minor, in the *Diaspora* generally. Again, while the earlier critics found the secret of the growth and success of Christianity in the genius and conduct of individuals — a Jesus, a Paul — the twentieth century has discovered everywhere the influence and work of the Community — the Church — and as surely as 'Paulinism' was more than 'Paul' so was 'Christianity' more than Christ, that is Jesus.

The result that emerges, or at least is adumbrated, is that the Christianity of the Early Church — even the Christianity documented in the New Testament is no mere product of Judaism pure and simple — nor even of such Judaism married to Hellenism pure and simple: but is a product of Community thought, and life, saturated with an Orientalized Paganism, and a Paganized Judaism, into which Orphism, Mysticism, Platonism, Stoicism, and no end of other isms had sunk deeply.

## THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW

By the Rev. B. P. W. STATHER HUNT, B.D., Rector of Pakefield, Lowestoft.

**I**N speaking of the O.T. quotations in the First Gospel Dr. Salmon says: 'Several such quotations are peculiar to St. Matthew, and are introduced by the formula "that it might be fulfilled." In these the ordinary rule is that the Evangelist does not take the quotation from the LXX, but translates directly from the Hebrew.'<sup>1</sup> A simpler explanation would be that the Editor drew his Messianic prophecies from a different source from that which provided him with his incidental quotations. For it is difficult to believe that he took the trouble to look up certain of his quotations in the Hebrew Bible and translate them into Greek himself, while he was quite satisfied with the LXX translation for the rest. Few who have studied Dr. Rendel Harris' two volumes of *Testimonies* with the wealth of evidence there brought forward in such a convincing manner can doubt that Dr. Harris is right in asserting that the Evangelists were quoting from collections of 'testimonies' which existed before the writing of most, if not all, of the books of the N.T. Dr. Salmon next draws attention to the fact that as a rule 'when the Evangelists differ from our text of the LXX they all agree in the deviation.' If we could be certain that this divergency is not due to harmonization we should have, in certain cases, positive evidence for an earlier common source, other than the LXX, for such quotations. Additional evidence for the existence of such a primitive source is supplied by the fact that quotations in the N.T. are often composite, and are sometimes attributed to the wrong author (*e.g.* *Mk.* i, 2); which suggests that they were taken from a collection of testimonies, and not directly from the LXX.

To which may be added another consideration. It is quite understandable that individual writers may be tempted to give strained and unnatural interpretations of certain texts, a temptation to which the writers of the N.T. have sometimes succumbed; but when you find that Fathers from every part of the Church agree in altering the wording of a text to give it such a far-fetched interpretation, it seems reasonable to suppose that such use goes back earlier than any of them. Thus *Deut.* xxviii, 66-67:

'And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear night and day, and shalt have none assurance of thy life: in the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! and at even shalt thou say, Would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart which thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see.'

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 220.

is used as a prophecy of the crucifixion, to which it has no reference whatever, by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory of Nyssa, Novatian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Rufinus, Jerome, Theodoret, and possibly also by St. Paul when he wrote (*Gal.* iii, 1) 'before whose very eyes Jesus Christ has been prophesied as the crucified One.' *Is.* lxxv, 2, is used in a similar manner by Barnabas, Justin (thrice), Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory, Cyril and Rufinus.

But I wish to carry Dr. Harris' argument a step farther. I believe that these collections of testimonia were not merely handy books of reference, but that they were the earliest Christian didactic literature. We do not know the type of *literature* current in the earliest years of the Church's life, but if St. Luke is in any way reliable we may learn from the *Acts* the type of *teaching*, and it is an axiom that religious literature reflects the teaching current at the time of writing. There can be no doubt what that teaching was, for every speech is formed on the same pattern. The apostolic argument was simplicity itself; 'Here are events prophesied in the O.T.; here is a Man to Whom these events happened "as ye yourselves know" (*Acts* ii, 22). The conclusion is obvious; this Man must be the Messiah.'

Here, in a nut-shell, is the whole kernel of the apostolic preaching. It is the never-changing pattern of their argument, and every Israelite must submit to its clear logic. When we come to the Gospels we find the same pattern there. As Hoskyns says (*Mysterium Christi*, pp. 70-71):

'There is no event or utterance recorded of Him which does not proceed from a conception of the Messiahship smelted and sublimed from the ore of the O.T. Scriptures.'

Indeed St. Paul himself (*Acts* xiii, 32-33) describes the Gospel as consisting in the announcing of the good news that God had fulfilled His promises and prophesies in the Person of Jesus of Nazareth, while the first Evangelist puts into the mouth of our Lord the statement that His Church was to be built upon the fact that He was Christ, that is the long-promised Messiah (*Mt.* xvi, 16, 18). It was not until this fact had been placed beyond all doubt that teaching could be given as to what *kind* of a Messiah He was, and the story of His life set out. The most cursory reading of the early Fathers will convince the reader that this type of argument was not confined to the first century, nor to the Greek and Latin world. Ephraem Syrus maintained that the O.T. was merely pre-history:

'Come hither thou troop of prophets, ye interpreters of verities. See ye the King hath not turned aside from the way ye trod out for Him.'

Rise, David, and look closely at the Son of David, as thou hast preached Him . . . Zachary, thou Prophet, rise and give praise, that thy prophecy was accomplished . . . Aged Jacob, rise, give praise . . . for He hath bound the colt to the vine, and to the vine-branch the foal of the ass' (from the 'Rhythm against the Jews,' delivered on Palm Sunday).

Ephraem is only putting into words the fundamental tenet of the primitive Church, that the whole outline of the life of Christ was mapped out for Him beforehand by the Prophets; and the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses a similar thought in *Heb.* i, 1-2 :

'God, Who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, Whom he hath appointed heir of all (their prophecies?)'

It is difficult to imagine that none of this early teaching was committed to writing. Would St. Paul have been content to leave converts of only a few weeks' standing without any sort of a manual to refresh their memory and to strengthen their hold on the new Faith? How is it that in none of the Epistles do we find any teaching, except incidentally, concerning the main doctrines of Christiaity? No attempt is made to *prove* the truths bound up in the stories of the crucifixion and the resurrection, yet these truths are of far greater importance than any of the questions with which the writers deal; indeed unless they are taken for granted the whole fabric of the Epistles falls to pieces. Is this strange omission due to the fact that the readers already had in their hands a Testimony Book whose function was to prove these fundamental doctrines? Much that is obscure in the Pauline Epistles would become as clear as day if we could think so. I believe that St. Paul frequently refers his readers to such a book, especially in his *Epistles to the Galatians*, and that he is referring to its chapter-headings in iii, 1, where he points to the section entitled 'That the Messiah must suffer'<sup>2</sup>; in iii, 7, where he says, 'You know'<sup>3</sup> that it is the faithful who are the children of Abraham' (for this is dealt with in the section of your Testimony Book headed by *Is.* liv, 1); and in the obscure passage in *Gal.* iv, 25, where he is contrasting Sinai, the fiery, untouchable, mountain of the first covenant (cf. *Heb.* xii, 18) with the spiritual Sion (the mountain that was to fill the earth of *Dan.* ii, 44) of the new covenant. (See the pseudo-Cyprianic tract *De montibus.*)

It would not be unfair to claim that the Gospels and the *Acts* are testimony books set in a historical framework, and that St.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Lk.* ix, 22; xvii, 25; xxiv, 26, 46; *Acts* iii, 18; xvii, 3; xxvi, 3.

<sup>3</sup> γινώσκετε is indicative and not imperative according to Cyprian *Test.* i, 5; *Ep.* lxiii, 4; cf. ἐπαυῶτε in *Jn.* v, 39.

Mark's supreme contribution to the literature of the world was that he was the first to take the current Testimony Books, which were in disconnected sections with no hint of continuity or chronology, and arrange their contents into a connected story of the life of our Lord. In the preface to his Gospel one of his imitators, St. Luke, states that 'Many took in hand (aorist not perfect) to draw up a declaration of those things which have been fulfilled (so Syr. Sin., Vulg. R.V.) amongst us.' He states that he is writing in order to add further confirmation to the facts recorded in that document in which 'Theophilus' had been instructed. If this is a true interpretation of that preface certain facts emerge. (1) That there was a written document from which Theophilus had been instructed. (2) That this was an account of the way in which the Messianic prophecies had been fulfilled. (3) That St. Luke expresses his intention of confirming and supplementing that document. For he speaks of a document, in the singular. I know that it might be possible to take the word in a collective sense, but while I believe that when St. Luke wrote there was more than one collection of *Testimonia* in existence, it is at least possible that he is referring to the original 'declaration' from which they were all derived. If St. Luke's stories told in *Lk.* xiv, 25-27, 44-47, are correct, the talks there recorded would have provided matter for that declaration from the mouth of our Lord Himself; and in any case it appears that St. Luke believed that our Lord was responsible for the first Christian collection of *Testimonia*, to which, be it noted, was added a brief account of the way in which they had been fulfilled. If such discourses were recorded it is not impossible that it was St. Matthew who wrote down the combined recollection of the 'many' (the eleven of the 120 of *Acts* i, 15?) who had listened to them. This would explain the genesis of the tradition that St. Matthew wrote the *Logia* in Hebrew (Aramaic), and that the Apostles each contributed to a combined 'declaration' of Faith before they separated. It would also explain the constant tradition that the Apostles left behind them some official document, later identified with the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

This hypothesis would throw more light on the famous statement of Papias.

'So then Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew (Aramaic) language, and each one interpreted them as he could' (Papias, cited by Eusebius, H.E. III, 39).

When we realize that what Papias meant by *Logia* was not the oracular sayings of our Lord, but the (O.T.) oracles *about* Him, there does not seem to be any insuperable objection to believing that St. Matthew may have been responsible, if only as an amanuensis, for recording the first Christian collection of testimonia,

written in Aramaic; from which, when translated into Greek, the Evangelists derived their O.T. quotations. Nor does there seem to be any intrinsic objection to the idea that the Apostles issued some kind of a 'declaration' concerning the basic doctrines which they taught, as they did concerning one particular aspect of them in the Jerusalem decrees. Something of this kind seems almost inevitable, and St. Luke's statement that the many 'delivered' it to us implies an official delivery of a single document, rather than a haphazard passing on of many from hand to hand. Exactly the same word is used by St. Paul in *I Cor.* xv, 3, when, apparently, he is speaking of a short 'creed' which he had 'delivered' to his converts.<sup>4</sup> It is also used in *Acts* vi, 14; xvi, 4; *Rom.* vi, 17; *I Cor.* xi, 2 and 23; *II Pet.* ii, 21; and *Jude* 3. In every case when it occurs in the N.T. in this sense the word implies some official 'delivery,' and it is unlikely that *Lk.* i, 2, should be an exception. Such a 'declaration' would have been of extreme value to those 'scattered abroad' (*Acts* viii, 44) after only a short training in the Faith. If such a document existed it would be carried by them over a wide area, with the inevitable result that it would soon exist in more than one recension.

But yet more important results would follow. If these Testimony Books were used for the instruction of catechumens they would attract to themselves numerous stories of the way in which the testimonies they contained had been fulfilled. The number of such stories would tend to increase, and the illustrations used by the instructors would not always be the same in different Churches; so that by the time St. Mark came to write his Gospel these Testimony Books with their attached stories would provide a store-house of incidents upon which to draw. The Editor of the first Gospel, attracted by the beauty and usefulness of *Mark*, followed his example, but laid greater stress upon the fulfilment of prophecy, and by the title which he gave his work claimed that it was based upon the old Testimony Book which was attributed to St. Matthew. St. Luke tells us himself, if I am correct in my interpretation, that he too bases his Gospel on the Testimony Book, but desires to supplement and confirm the information which it contained, putting it in chronological order (*καθεξῆς*). The greater part of the Synoptic Gospels could have been derived from the Testimony Book and its additions. Thus the story of the Passion is set entirely within a testimony frame. There is no

<sup>4</sup> 'I delivered unto you first of all that which I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures.' (St. Paul in *I Corinthians* xv, 3-4).

single incident (with the exception of two, *Mk.* xiv, 51-52; xv, 21, which apparently were of personal interest to St. Mark) which is not related to some proof-text. Similarly the reason why no incidents of our Lord's everyday life at Nazareth are recorded in the Gospels may be due to the fact that there were no obvious testimonies on which to hang them.

The early Fathers (Greek and Latin) followed the same testimony principle as did the Apostles. They were so 'testimony-minded' that they dared not take a step without the authority of some proof-text. This is the more strange since to them the O.T. was the sacred book of a rival religion, against whose attacks they had to defend the Christian Religion. Yet many of them felt bound to give the ground of their belief in the form of a Testimony Book. *e.g.* Justin (whose *First Apology* and *Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew*, are Testimony Books in a popular form, the former addressed to the Pagan world, the latter to Greek-speaking Jewish communities), Irenaeus, Cyprian, and Eusebius. Although the value of a Testimony Book would tend to decrease as the Church became almost entirely Gentile, yet the tradition was so strong that it persists to the present day, and is embodied in the modern reference Bible. There can be only one explanation of this phenomenon, and that is that the O.T. is regarded by the Christian as his own sacred book, on whose testimonies the Christian Church was originally founded. *The Testimony Book was not written to prove the truth of the Gospels: the Gospels were written to illustrate the truth contained in the Testimony Book.*

One of the most interesting Testimony Books is Eusebius' *Demonstratio*, the sequel to his *Praeparatio*. The Gospels themselves could be almost entirely reconstructed from it, for it relates almost every incident in our Lord's life to some proof-text. Thus Eusebius deals in detail with the Jewish tradition that the Messiah would re-enact the miracles performed by Moses. Moses fasted forty days, so did our Lord; Moses fed the people in the wilderness, so did our Lord; Moses tamed the sea, so did our Lord; Moses cleansed the leper, so did our Lord; Moses chose seventy elders, so did our Lord. Almost every detail of Christ's life is brought within the framework of the Testimony Book. There is not the slightest reason why a book similar to the *Demonstratio* of Eusebius should not have been written before A.D. 60: on the contrary there is every reason why it should. Had there been such a book it is obvious that it would have provided the Synoptists with ample material for compiling a continuous account of our Lord's life. Can it be that that elusive source 'Q' was really a Testimony Book? For it is becoming more and more certain that 'Q' was known in some form to *all* the Synoptists, and not merely

to the first and third. The arrangement of the contents of the Testimony Book in chronological order, together with editorial additions from other sources, would produce a Gospel like *Matthew* or *Mark*—the selections of material being made in accordance with aspects of Christ's life which the compiler of the Gospel wished to emphasize. In connection with the *Demonstratio* there is another possibility which is worth considering. Apparently Eusebius was well acquainted with the works of Papias. It is at least possible that the *Demonstratio* owes a considerable amount of its material to the Testimony Book of Papias; in which case we are carried back directly to the first half of the second century, and indirectly to the first half of the first century.

This article is, of necessity, the merest *outline* of a theory. Hitherto most scholars who have dealt with the Synoptic problems have tried to work back from the Gospels to their *immediate* sources, such as Q, L, M, etc. In my researches and theories I have sought to go back to those literary sources which lie behind them all and to work forward from that point.

'The New Testament is concealed (*latet*) in the Old, and the Old Testament is revealed (*patet*) in the New' (St. Augustine).

## BOOK REVIEWS

### THE TUTOR OF ISAAC NEWTON\*

Mr. Osmond, who over thirty years ago wrote what is still the standard life of John Cosin, has now turned his attention to another seventeenth century worthy, Isaac Barrow. In many ways Cosin presents an easier topic. He has his niche in ecclesiastical history, and he was nothing apart from his profession. But Barrow's versatility makes it much harder to place him. Dr. Henson remarked: 'As scholar, mathematician, man of science, preacher, controversialist, his credit in each would have made a reputation for an ordinary man.' We may agree if we limit that reputation to his own age. Barrow was a man of unusual talent, but we may feel that he dissipated it. Like John Evelyn, had he cared to concentrate upon one line of study, he might have achieved something enduring. Barrow appears to have mastered several dissimilar subjects in turn and then to have lost interest in each. But since he was only 47 when he died, this judgement is perhaps unfair. His later years might have been crowned with the accomplishment of some enduring work: on the other hand, he might have declined into a bishopric. In these days of necessary specialization, Barrow may serve as a shining example of the gifted amateur once preferred to the expert. The amateur tradition might flourish in a simpler society where there was less to know, but we are all now condemned, if we wish to accomplish anything, to know more and more about less and less.

Mr. Osmond, like his hero, remains faithful to the amateur tradition. He has not searched for unpublished material even from so obvious a source as the archives of Trinity College, Cambridge, but he has made accessible what has long been out of print. For both the mathematical and the theological

\* *Isaac Barrow: His Life and Times*, by P. H. Osmond. (S.P.C.K. 1944. 12/6.)

works he has been content not to go behind nineteenth century texts. There is an index but no bibliography. From the Oxinden Papers, published in 1933, Mr. Osmond has been able to supply some facts relating to the Barrow family.

Barrow did not lack the wit that lightens ponderous learning. As court chaplain he scored off the brilliant and dissolute Earl of Rochester in an encounter authentically reported :

ROCHESTER : Doctor, I am yours to the shoe-tie.

BARROW : My Lord, I am yours to the ground.

ROCHESTER : Doctor, I am yours to the centre of the earth.

BARROW : My Lord, I am yours to the Antipodes.

ROCHESTER : Doctor, I am yours to the lowest pit of hell.

BARROW (*turning on his heel*) : There, my Lord, I leave you.

The story of Barrow's examination for Orders will also bear repetition. The examining chaplain asked three questions *viva voce* :

CHAPLAIN : *Quid est fides?*

BARROW : *Quod non vides.*

CHAPLAIN : *Quid est spes?*

BARROW : *Magna res.*

CHAPLAIN : *Quid est caritas?*

BARROW : *Magna raritas.*

The chaplain was displeased, but the bishop was indulgent. The reader may recall Mr. Christopher Isherwood's account of answering his Tripos questions in verse, but with more serious consequences.

Barrow's life was essentially a don's. He was indeed a royal chaplain and a prebendary of Sarum, but he never held a cure of souls, so that he disproved the rule laid down in so many books on pastoral theology that profitable preaching is based on personal knowledge of other people's needs. For a royalist, whose father preferred exile, Barrow was tolerantly treated by the Puritan authorities of Trinity College, even when he uttered rash political statements. But it was expedient that he should absent himself from England for a while, and from 1655 to 1659 he was given permission to travel, with a small allowance from the college. In Paris Barrow saw his father, whom he relieved, proceeded to Florence, was deterred from Rome by an outbreak of the plague, and sailed from Leghorn to Constantinople. On the journey his ship had to beat off a Barbary corsair. The details of his travels are preserved in Latin epistles, in prose and verse, sent to Trinity. Barrow's return in 1659 was shortly followed by the Restoration, but this event made little difference to his career. He had been appointed college Reader in Latin before his travels. In 1662 he became Regius Professor of Greek, and in the same year was Professor of Geometry at Gresham College. These preferments enabled him to refuse the offer of becoming librarian to Sir Robert Cotton's library. Later the Greek chair was exchanged for the more lucrative Professorship of Mathematics, and it was in this capacity that his best work was done. Hitherto Oxford had been less discouraging to mathematical studies than Cambridge, but Barrow, and his more famous pupil and successor, Sir Isaac Newton, established the great Cambridge mathematical tradition. As Mr. Osmond observes : ' Isaac Barrow may be said to have originated the tradition, still persisting fifty years ago, according to which the most finished product of Cambridge University was a first-rate mathematician who had devoted considerable attention to the classical languages.'

But mathematics too was abandoned, this time in favour of theology. Barrow proceeded D.D. and became a royal chaplain, in which capacity he pleased Charles II well enough to make him Master of Trinity when Pearson became Bishop of Chester. His Mastership was marked by the erection of the present library under the direction of Sir Christopher Wren, an achievement which alone would place him among the more notable Masters. He was a rigid observer of the college statutes and refused even Newton a dispensation. His period of office as Vice-Chancellor was less successful.

As proof of his theological ability he left a Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, which was useful in its day but has gone the way of controversial divinity. He was better known as a preacher. For the copyright of his anti-papal treatise and the sermons Barrow's father, who survived him, was paid £470. Mr. Osmond treats Barrow's sermons at some length, with due acknowledgments to Mr. Fraser Mitchell's *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson*. Barrow was averse from Calvinism and influenced by the Cambridge Platonists in a Latitudinarian direction, though his enlightenment did not extend to a disbelief in witchcraft. So we need not be surprised if Mr. Osmond tells us:

'His rôle as preacher was to be an expounder of moral theology rather than of dogmatics or of hot Gospel appeal of which there had been too much latterly, with disastrous results in the recrudescence of paganism.'

Charles II remarked that Barrow's exhaustiveness was unfair to later preachers who should attempt the same subject. This was a real though unusual fault. A sermon, like an essay, should not be exhaustive.

Mr. Osmond has produced a useful and readable book which should interest Cambridge men.

P. R. SMYTHE.

### SPIRITUALISM AS A RELIGION\*

Dr. Inge has said that only two Churches in England have increased their membership in recent years, the Roman Catholic and Christian Science. A third must be added, the Spiritualistic. At the present time and after the war Spiritualism is likely to increase still more, since some of those who have lost friends and relatives will turn to it in order to get into touch with them again. What sort of a religion, then, is Spiritualism, and what is its value? Dr. Butterworth has written a wise, well-informed and temperate book to answer these questions. Spiritualists have no authoritative book of doctrine such as Mrs. Eddy provided for Christian Scientists. But they have plenty of writers to expound their beliefs. The core of their faith is belief in an after-life. Dr. Butterworth quotes Conan Doyle:

'The results of psychical research, the deductions which we draw, and the lessons we may learn, teach us of the continued life of the soul, of the nature of that life, and of how it is influenced by our conduct here. If this is distinct from religion, I must confess that I do not understand it. To me it is religion—the very essence of it' (p. 126).

And again from another eminent Spiritualist, Stainton Moses:

'All the religious systems of the world rest on a belief in the future life' (p. 126).

Here is the reason for the attraction of Spiritualism. But the basis of religion is faith in God, not belief in a future life. To quote Dr. Butterworth:

'To the Spiritualists' claim to have discovered the sole adequate basis for religion, we must reply with a direct and unhesitating negative. We have already argued that Spiritualism is an unsatisfying religion, and we may add that it is unsatisfying for this very reason, that it is built upon the wrong foundation. Build your religion upon a consciousness of God, and faith in an after-life will follow, sufficient to carry the religious soul over the darkest periods of life here. But the character of the after-life we hope for will depend upon the character of the God we believe in.'

But Spiritualism is very little concerned with God. Dr. Butterworth describes it as follows:

'Popular Spiritualism does not appear to need God at all; neither does it refer to Him except in a casual and distant manner. The object

\* *Spiritualism and Religion*, by G. W. Butterworth, D.Litt. (S.P.C.K. 1944. 9/-.)

of a séance is to obtain communion with the spirits of the departed, not with God. When messages from the spirit world are obtained, the purpose of the séance is accomplished. The inquirer becomes convinced that someone he has loved, whom he thought to be dead, is not dead, but alive. The message has revealed nothing whatever about God, and more often than not nothing significant about human life. It has simply shown by the recital of some curious piece of information that the dead person knows or knew something connected with the inquirer's life. This revelation when accepted, as it usually is, in childlike faith may issue in two ways. The problem of death being as they sincerely believe solved, they go back to their church and their customary worship with strengthened faith' (p. 106).

What need is there for God in such a religion? Dr. Butterworth leaves it to a Spiritualist to supply the answer. He quotes Stainton Moses :

'Spirits who return to earth have little to tell, apparently, of God. The general drift of spirit-teaching is curiously in the direction of a refined and spiritualised Pantheism. We hear little of the Great Judge, the King of Heaven. We hear much of the tender guardians, of their benevolent interference with this world, of the educational methods they employ. To their listening ear comes the cry that brings willing aid and loving sympathy. Not, as it seems, and is indeed probable enough, to the ear of the Supreme. Yet they say much of the blessing that comes of earnest prayer, and inculcate that duty upon us. The reflex benefits, as well as its direct blessings, are uniformly insisted on. But it is the intermediary agent that hears and responds' (p. 125).

A religion so nearly without God as Spiritualism hardly deserves the name of religion at all. It is superficial, sentimental and secular. The deep insights of Christianity into the mysteries of sin and suffering, punishment and atonement are ignored. In their places Spiritualists receive messages assuring them that their loved ones on the other side are well and happy, and remain much the same as they were on earth, interested in similar things, occupied with similar employments. They show no proof of growing in either knowledge, goodness or spiritual understanding.

Now let us ask the question, what results have been obtained by psychical research? Spiritualists claim that they have proved the after-life. Have they done so? Have they proved that at least some of the messages said to have been received through mediums must have come from people already dead?

Dr. Butterworth quotes the weighty opinion of Mr. Harry Price in his book, *Fifty Years of Psychical Research* :

'I have said little about the spirit hypothesis in this last chapter because I consider that the Spiritualists have not proved their case. I admit, however, that the spirit theory covers many of the facts. The messages alleged to have been received from the spirits never rise above the cultural level of the mediums through whom they are received, and I think that all spirit phenomena will be explained on natural, rather than supernatural grounds, when we know the laws that govern them. And some faculties, such as lucidity, thought-transference, clairvoyance and allied extra-sensory phenomena, are probably natural and normal to those gifted persons possessing them. And we know so little about the subconscious, and so little more about the conscious mind, that, probably either one or the other may be responsible for the mental "miracles" we investigate. I fail to see why the spirits must be dragged in to bolster up a theory, however grateful and comforting, when at least as good an alternative theory is available. Coupled with this is the vast amount of humbug, charlatanism and general tomfoolery which goes by the name

of spiritualism and which appears to be the backbone of the industry' (p. 160).

Striking results are sometimes obtained through mediums. What is their most likely explanation? If one rejects the Spiritualist hypothesis, one may prefer that of the Old Testament, still held by many Christians. Mediumship due to possession by evil spirits and is therefore wrong. 'Thou shalt not offer a witch to live.' Some think that mediums possess powers now rare, but which will become quite common with the progress of humanity. Dr. Butterworth, however, with more reason, prefers the opposite hypothesis:

'There remains the other and far more likely hypothesis that in all psychic phenomena there is at work a rudimentary faculty which was necessary for the maintenance and propagation of life before sense perception had reached its present condition and before, in the human species, reason had emerged. It is known that horses and dogs are highly susceptible to psychic influences. In man personality and self-consciousness have reached what appears to be their limit under terrestrial conditions, and with them have developed reason and the faculties of moral and aesthetic judgment. With the aid of these man can do all he needs to do for the short space of his life here. Strictly speaking, he ought not to exhibit psychic powers at all. Yet he too, like the animal and the insect, is in constant touch with the life, flashes of which bubble up, as it were, in ways which we can neither control or understand. When they are used, if we may say so, legitimately, to awaken his awe and reverence at the deep mystery of life, or to kindle his efforts after goodness or his search for truth, so that he takes them up into the fullness of his being and uses them under the sovereign control of reason and love, then all is well. The psychic impulse, thus utilized, is the source of inspiration and genius. But when he surrenders himself to this impulse, and allows it to usurp the place which should be occupied by his higher functions, then error ensues' (p. 184).

In a wise concluding passage Dr. Butterworth insists that all psychic phenomena should be valued not according to their seeming marvellousness, but to their intrinsic worth, submitted to the judgment of the rational and moral consciousness.

'Psychic phenomena . . . are set before us in immense variety, and we must choose between them by our own judgments of value, matured by experience, encouraging those which minister to the higher life and disregarding the rest. All of them from the vision of Christ saying "I am he that liveth and was dead," to the humblest example of telepathy, proceed from something outside the framework of our ordinary world . . . At the highest, as in the vision of Christ just referred to, they impart a new hope, strength and direction to human life . . . Lower forms of psychic expression may occasionally have a limited utility, as when some dream or presentiment gives warning of a danger that can be avoided. But none of these lower forms is necessary to human life . . . To rely on psychic powers for anything which common-sense, foresight and severe mental effort can do for us is a retrogression and not an advance' (p. 189).

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

## THE RE-CREATION OF CHRISTIANITY

In my undergraduate days in Cambridge one of the pleasantest hours in the week was that spent in the company of Professor Stanley Cook. The subject which drew our small gathering would hardly have suggested itself as the most thrilling, for it was Unpointed Hebrew Unseens, but such an idea

could have been possible only to one who did not know Professor Cook. I can see him still, a piece of chalk in each hand, writing with equal facility from left to right or right to left; even the dulllest page was enlivened by his witticisms, and the extent of his knowledge left us gasping. I did not know then, but I know now that *Who's Who* informs the world that his recreations include conjuring and juggling as well as lawn-tennis. I was reminded of these acquisitions on reading this book. How, I asked myself, does he manage to keep so many balls in the air at one time to form so intricate a pattern? The sciences rise one after the other mingling with ancient and modern philosophies, the comparative study of religion and the Bible in its largest setting of anthropology and history are quickly followed by recent social and political theory and practice. Once more I stand and gape in wonderment as to how he does it, and I am relieved when he explains that 'the whole is the outcome of many years' work.'

Dr. Cook in his Pelican, *The Rebirth of Christianity*,\* helps his reviewers in the Preface which describes his approach to the formulation of an adequate philosophy. For him history is more than the record of political, social and economic changes. Much more significant in the long run are the decisive developments in men's ideas of themselves and of their destiny. Hence, the religious problem is the most fundamental of all problems of our day, and behind all serious planning lies the question of a religion for the world.

'If there is to be any real cultural progress, a re-statement of Religion in general and of Christianity in particular is undoubtedly called for.'

With an acknowledged debt to A. N. Whitehead and other organismic thinkers, Dr. Cook finds an inter-relation between the processes of Nature and those in Man.

'Throughout are grades of spirit, energy or activity, both in Nature's creative powers and in Man's creative thinking about himself, the Universe and the God of the Universe.'

More important even than the 'Theory of Religion' is the fact that from time to time it is given to men to put their theories and convictions to the test of the ultimate realities of life and action. Such a time is, in Dr. Cook's opinion, our present age.

'A realistic view is taken of the tremendous forces operating in Nature and Man, forces striving for expression and issuing often enough in forms we consider harmful and evil, in false and fanatical idealism, in perversity of genius, and in what may look like Religion but is its worst enemy. It is the function of a living and effective religion to guide and canalize life, experience, thought and action; the "religious" and the "non-religious" hemispheres cannot be long kept apart.'

In 218 pages closely printed is packed a wealth of learning, 'A largess universal, like the sun his liberal eye doth give to every one, thawing cold fear,' and I would add to Shakespeare's words, stirring all minds, or at any rate the minds of the intelligent. Those unready to give their minds to great problems will find no help here: Dr. Cook has no love for those who wrap themselves in garments of ignorance or of self-righteousness. Even the wise should be happy to regard themselves as the *Drosophila* of the laboratory of the Universe:

'Man, it has been said, is his own guinea-pig; and to our vivisection of animals for the furtherance of our knowledge there might seem to correspond the processes that experiment on us—and, if we are wise, add to universal experience—as though we were the maid-of-all-work, the fruit-fly *Drosophila* of the laboratory of the Universe.'

\* *The Rebirth of Christianity*, by Stanley Cook. (Pelican Press. 1942.)

ere is a realism which will be thoroughly disliked in quarters where the ect gather, but before they can pull themselves together after the impact such an explosive idea, another shot may add to their disarray:

'Outside our systems are data which we have ignored — wrongly or unavoidably; they might disturb our formulas or our faith! They find no place in the declensions and paradigms of our grammar of the Universe, but they should not be wanting from our Lexicons. They may prove useful later or serve other purposes.'

After a long introductory chapter, in which is stressed the fact that the present situation is one which raises the issue, whether religion itself, and not solely the religion of any one of us, will survive, Dr. Cook notes the wide hostility to any dualistic view of the world; a world over against and confronting this world is meaningless, it obscures the problems of our daily life, he observes, and we are greatly hampered because we have inherited past ways of thinking and are unconscious of the regulative ideas, presuppositions and axioms by which we are guided. We must 'grasp the nettle' and consider the task of a re-statement of Christianity as the way to a 'Re-birth.' It will be found that it is not enough to reiterate one's convictions, and in subsequent chapters Dr. Cook aims at suggesting the absolute regionality of Christianity. He does so by considering first of all the theory of religion as this may be understood by a study of the Biblical literature and by the science of Comparative Religion. There follows a consideration of soul and body in the widest sense of those words as including the processes of Nature, man's physical and mental processes, and the connexion between Nature and man. He rightly says:

'Just as the development of thought turns upon an extension of our range, which has been too narrow or too isolated, so in the emergence of the new we do not merely pass from p to q but have to consider the larger indispensable body or field within which the process has taken place.'

His idea of the 'field' is of the greatest importance not only for the biologist but for the theologian, and I am grateful to Dr. Cook for the emphasis he lays upon it, and it inevitably influences all that he has to say in the next three chapters on God, Man and the Universe. We as individuals are 'abstractions,' integral parts of some greater and more permanent whole or unit. It is this truth which lies behind Miquel de Unamuno's cry, 'To be the whole of myself is to be everybody else.' We are not only localized individuals but beings capable of becoming more universal and cosmic:

'The problem of Evil still remains; but the Universe that includes such blights as cancer and aerial warfare also created men with conscience and brains, and only when we can honestly assure ourselves that we are entirely guiltless of all evil shall we perhaps begin to know how to re-state that problem. If there is both creativism and freedom to go on our own selfish ways, there is also a process that corrects and repairs; it restores the "wholeness" of a mutilated organism and the balance which has been upset and, not merely preserving a type, it aims at higher types in this still unfinished Universe.'

Two chapters on Christianity and the Future conclude the book, to which Dr. Cook adds by way of postscript a discussion of a Christian 'Order,' the ideals of which shall be mutual respect, tolerance and charity (in the old sense of the term), sincerity and good faith, a community of basic unifying principles whose value and authority could be accepted by men of goodwill.

'The ideals recognize the value of individuals and aim at a greater richness of personality and a higher type of community. They depend

upon a balance of rights and responsibilities of the one and the whole.' Our clue to the Universe lies not in the electrons of our analysis, but in the Self that was analysed and seeks to improve its conceptions; and the ability to deal with the *data* of experience and pursue them and their implications to the limit is more fundamental than the *data* themselves. Mind and the elements of matter are not at two ends of a scale, and to-day the concrete and the concept are "met together," physics and metaphysics have "kissed each other."

Thus Dr. Cook throws the responsibility of Christian re-birth upon each individual to combine the duties of the present with their hopes for the future. This book is a plea for the dedicated mind untrammelled and fearless in the struggle.

There are, as Dr. Cook readily admits, many points on which his readers will differ from him, and this is inevitable in so wide a survey. I would myself question whether we shall be able very much longer to use even the phrase, which Dr. Cook employs so often, 'the Body of Christ,' with any meaning intelligible to the modern mind. While it is obviously difficult to get out of our historical skins, any healthy development shows itself in shedding outworn epidermis and growing a new skin from below and within. In other words, our religion, if it is to have relevance and reality, must be shown to grow naturally out of our here-and-now both in content and in form. Those about to be born will not thank us, even in these days of coupons for most things, if all we can offer them are garments out of the ancestral wardrobe cut and fashioned on more up-to-date lines. A re-birth will demand more than re-statement, it will involve a radical attempt to be religious for ourselves in our present situation rather than in the situation of any previous century, however illuminated it may have been. Dr. Cook would go a long way in the rigorous application of the principle, 'Leave the dead to bury their dead,' but not, I think, far enough. As a distinguished Biblical scholar he is so thoroughly at home in his *data* that perhaps he is apt to forget that other people are not so familiar, nor indeed are they prepared to use words, however long their sacred history, which need continual explanation, expansion, and correction, to serve another age. Why, for instance, speak on p. 157 of 'Christ the Logos' and on p. 164 of 'God, the Divine Logos'? The latter might find a place in a modern statement of a philosophy of wholes, though I see no reason for retaining the Greek word; the former can have no place except on the ground that Christ and Logos have historical connexions in the thought of centuries long since departed. 'Humanism,' writes Dr. Cook, 'really has no earthly justification; but it can be deepened and spiritualized.' Here the stress is on 'earthly,' and certainly humanism at its best points beyond itself, and his sentence could with equal truthfulness be used of much Christian theology. I am sure he will agree that each should start from that strange synthesis we call Man and in what Whitehead calls 'the primary expressions of the intuitions of the finest types of religious lives.' In this way we are led to the creation and recognition of ever more significant wholes, of which Jesus is one. And, let us not shrink from the fact that in the formation of any new synthesis there is often a break-up of the old, disorder, conflict, and death; it is thus we advance in all realms into new harmonious unities. It is as true of modern as of ancient times that . . .

years are not life;  
 Years are the shells of life, and empty shells  
 When they hold only days, and days and days.

T. WIGLEY.

## THE GERMAN GOD AND THE GERMAN SOUL

The present conflict between the Allies and Germany is more than a war of nations: it is a struggle for opposed civilizations—Christian and Nazi. Each civilization reflects its own religion, which determines its culture. It is of urgent practical importance, therefore, to try and understand the German God and the German Soul. In studying the religion of the Germans under the Third Reich, three books written since the middle of the war will provide copious information.

## I.

*Thus Spake Germany*<sup>1</sup> (first published in July, 1941) is most important because—to quote the author's introduction—

'In the main body of this book the editors seldom interpose their own opinions. From beginning to end the words are those of Germans themselves.'

They are words of Germans in every profession, uttered in every phase of German history as far back as the rule of Frederick the Great. The bibliography—classified in ten sections according to author's profession—well exceeds a thousand volumes. The compilers modestly comment:

'We could not, for obvious reasons, consult German libraries, with their wealth of literature on Pangermanism. . . . When—after the war—German libraries are once more made accessible to foreigners, it will be possible to expand each chapter of our book into a volume. We sincerely hope that this may be done, so that the post-war world may gain a full knowledge of the German political mind.'

'We emphasize that we have no other aim than to point once more to a grave problem affecting Europe, conscious as we are of the fact that the best way of serving justice is to tell the naked truth, without attempting any subjective comment.'

In the Foreword to this volume Lord Vansittart writes of its compilers that they are 'of the highest distinction and authority who, belonging to a friendly nation, have adopted pseudonyms solely for important personal reasons due to the present war conditions.' The compilers are concerned with the one *Leitmotiv*: Pangermanism,' and have selected their evidence to prove this thesis (our italics):

'The Nazi revolution is not more than the fruition of inherited conceptions which find expression in varying forms in the works of Fichte, Hegel, Dietrich von Bülow, Arndt, Jahn, Friedrich List, Friedrich Ratzel, Karl Lamprecht, Prince Bismarck, Treitschke, Langbehn, Konstantin Frantz, Ludwig Woltmann, Josef Ludwig Reimer, Albrecht Wirth, Friedrich Lange, Albert Ballin, Hugo von Stinnes, Kardorff, Thyssen, and hundreds of others. In their speeches and writings these men elaborated many conceptions which are to-day part of National Socialism, such as the racial theory, the lust for world hegemony, the *Herrenvolk* thesis, the fight against Anglo-Saxon influences, the *desire to create an essentially German religion*, the ethic of ruthlessness and cruelty, the right of the superior German race to *Lebensraum* ('Living-space'), the principle of exterminating the native populations of conquered territories and colonizing them with Germans. All this is nineteenth or early twentieth-century German ideology.

Thus the contention that Nazism is the embodiment of a new "spirit of domination" is just as inaccurate as it would be to maintain that "Pangermanism" goes back only to Bismarck's time, and not to that of his predecessors.'

<sup>1</sup> *Thus Spake Germany*, edited by W. W. Coole and M. F. Potter. Third edition. (Routledge. 1942. 10/6.)

It is significant that the first section of this book is headed 'Outlook on Religion.' Nazi attempts to foster, direct and exploit an entirely German Religion are presented in many guises: 'Germany's yearning for a Messiah'; 'Cult of the Dictator'; 'The glorification of War'; 'A chosen race'; 'The *Lebensraum* theory'; 'Racial purity,' etc. How this religious Pangermanism is used for political purposes is disclosed in five chapters of astonishing quotations: 'German View of Other Races and Nations'; 'German Aims in International Politics and in War'; 'How Germany makes War'; 'Germany in Defeat. The Same Features but a Different Expression. Sabotage of Treaties and Preparation for Revenge'; 'Vae Victis! The Fate Reserved for the Vanquished. Colonisation and Compulsory Migration.'

Of the eighty utterances under 'Outlook on Religion' all save four belong to the twentieth century. We cite the most pertinent, omitting references, which the compilers give in full:

'I think we are declining because we have followed Christ and because we have lost our German soul, and wanted to gain, or want to gain, a Christian one.' (Ernst Wiechert, 1924.)

'We need a Faith that prays to a National God, not an international God of reward and punishment.' (Ernst Bergmann.)

'Either a German God, or none at all! The international God of Christendom is a patron of the Treaty of Versailles.' (Ernst Niekisch.)

'In a certain sense National Socialism is a religion, for it does not require its partisans to be convinced of the rightness of its teaching, but to believe in it.' (Paul Schnaber, 1935.)

'Just as Christ made his twelve disciples into a band faithful to the martyr's death whose faith shook the Roman Empire, so we now witness the same spectacle again: Adolf Hitler is the true Holy Ghost.' (Hans Kerrl, 1935.)

'It is only on one or two exceptional points that Christ and Hitler stand comparison, for Hitler is far too big a man to be compared with one so petty.' (Julius Streicher, 1935.)

'He who serves our Führer, Adolf Hitler, serves Germany, and he who serves Germany, serves God.' (Baldur von Schirach, 1936.)

'I believe in our own divinity when millions of Germans are leagued around one Leader; I know God to be in the Force (*Kraft*) of our blood alone.' (Profession of Faith of the Group, 1937.)

'To us now is risen the incarnation of what Christianity really is: Adolf Hitler.' (Hans Kerrl, 1937.)

'I completely agree with the German Christians who teach that the doctrine "Love thy neighbour as thyself" is valid only conditionally. The neighbour we shall love must be connected with us by blood and race.' (Hans Kerrl, 1937.)

'But everyone should clearly recognize and take to heart that the service of Germany, which is also a service of God, stands above the service of any domination. . . . We serve God by being loyal to our Führer and fulfilling our duty to our Fatherland. We are a God-believing youth, since we serve the divine land which is Germany.' (Baldur von Schirach, 1939.)

'I am tempted to believe rather in a Germanic God than a Christian one. We are not working for the next world but for this one.' (Dr. Goebbels, 1939.)

'This time God Almighty is not on the side of the hypocritical blasphemers. . . . God Almighty stands or falls with the strong German arms which clear the path for the whole Christian world.' (*The Free American*, New York Nazi Weekly, 1940.)

Certainly, from the evidence of *Thus Spake Germany*, the Nazi 'civilization' is deliberately based on a Pangerman Religion in which Germany is the Deity and Adolf Hitler the contemporary Messiah.

## II.

Stewart W. Herman, jun., the author of *It's Your Souls We Want*,<sup>2</sup> was Pastor of the American Church in Berlin from 1936 until the outbreak of war in September, 1939, when he joined the Berlin staff of the American Embassy. In Dec., 1941, at Germany's declaration of war on America, the author was interned and used the five months prior to his repatriation 'to marshal my material on the "church situation."' The title of the result (a 300 page volume containing two Appendices and a thorough Index) is a line in a Nazi newspaper poem. The spiritual sustenance promised by the order 'It's Your Souls We Want' is described thus:

'The general line followed by most Nazi orators is that which is given in the Nazi aphorism which is drilled into the youth: He who serves Germany serves God. This has been Hitler's own approach to religion, and those Nazis who would try to serve God first and Germany second are afraid that they might find themselves charged with treason. But, so far as the new idea of God is concerned, the Fuehrer has made only a few Delphic statements on the subject. This may account for the reticence of other high party leaders who, if they have any interest in God at all, do not care to thrust themselves far into territory which is as yet uncharted by an official party cartographer. Besides, to call upon God too much would betray a woeful lack of confidence in Hitler. Thus religion is made very "practical."'

This inevitable vagueness in defining the Germans' God is not clarified by the description of Hitler's own conception of the Deity:

'Does he (Hitler) believe in a personal God who is on his side or doesn't he? It would not be surprising if he himself did not know the answer to that question. Apparently he feels that his enormous power over the destinies of nations wells up out of some spring that is deeper than himself and he is at a loss to know what attitude he should take towards this *mysterium tremendum*. Obviously, none of the coherent religious systems appeals to him. There has been some talk to the effect that he is very superstitious and that he consults clairvoyants, but it is doubtful that these rumours, even if true, adequately explain his theology. His religion is Germany, or rather his idealized vision of Germany, to which he is ready to sacrifice both himself and the German people. He is probably the only high-ranking personage in the Government who feels this way about the country; the religion of all the others is Hitler himself, or the Nazi party, or their own appetite for power. Nine-tenths of his top men may be put in the latter category. Men like Goebbels, Ribbentrop, Himmler, and so on, will serve any god who, in turn, serves their purpose.

Because his pure love of an etherialized, non-existent Germany is so intense and self-immolating, Hitler's practical religion issues in an insane hatred of all Germany's "enemies." It is at this juncture that he takes abrupt leave of Christianity and plunges down the dark road to an idol which he himself cannot clearly see. He seems to entertain a child-like hope that his "God" can see the end of the road and attain it. That is why his names for God are limited to "The Foreseer" and "The Almighty."

<sup>2</sup> *It's your Souls we Want*, by Stewart W. Herman. (Harper Bros. 1943. \$2.50.)

His followers, meanwhile, are engaged in a triangular tug-of-war: back to the traditional Christian idea of God, on toward a new non-Christian, or quasi-Christian, mystical, impersonal Providence, and, thirdly, away from all faith in anyone or anything save the Nazi State and its Leader.'

All this 'Nazi Shintoism . . . is merely a political instrument for controlling masses of people,' but the instrument is worked with complete German thoroughness which is fully described in chapter ii, 'From the Cradle to the Grave.'

'Christening by water and the Holy Spirit is, of course, totally rejected in favour of a so-called simple declaration made by the child's father: "I swear by God this holy oath, that I am the father of this child of my wife and that I am demonstrably of Aryan descent. As father of this child I promise to raise him in the German spirit to the German Folk." The mother swears a similar oath. Only after this oath has been performed, presumably before an altar embellished with an image of Hitler, can this new member of the national family be given a "German Certificate of Origin" which will serve as the basic document for the rest of his life.'

This Nazi Baptism is followed in due course by Nazi Services of Confirmation, Marriage and Burial, all of which are carefully described.

Meanwhile, accompanying this bid for each German 'God believer's' soul, there has been the systematic obstruction of all possible Christian influence. The steps taken by the Nazi authorities to this end are fully detailed, including the series of conflicts with the Roman Catholic and Confessional Churches. The nett achievements of the Nazi régime appear in the orders issued to the German Evangelical Churches in Western Poland. They include suppression of all church publications, no opportunities for broadcasting, and even the prohibition of sick-visiting by the parochial clergy, except under special permit. As to the future, Mr. Herman summarizes the outlook as follows:

'The reconstruction of Europe after this war will not be merely a matter of economic rehabilitation, nor even of re-education in an academic sense, but of spiritual reformation and revival.'

### III.

*Christian Counter-Attack*<sup>3</sup> 'tries to tell in brief outline the story of what the Churches of Europe have done and suffered and learned in their struggle with Nazism. A surprising amount of reliable information is available through one channel or another, and the facts here recorded are only significant samples of what might be told.'

'But it can be asserted with knowledge that there are in Germany to-day thousands who have not bowed the knee to Hitler, who have been and are witnessing with fidelity and courage to Christ and remembering their fellowship in His universal Church. There have been not a few fine public acts of witness, and many more behind the scenes. To tell the full story would be to endanger liberty and life.'

Nevertheless the reader is given a fair outline of the Churches' struggle not only in Germany but also in all the occupied countries. The story of each of these is one of courageous leadership and protest, primarily for the rights of the Christian Church. In Germany itself:

'Between 1933 and 1939, 7,000 of these pastors (1,300 of them Protestants) were imprisoned, by the end of 1942 the figure had risen to

<sup>3</sup> *Christian Counter Attack*, by Hugh Martin and others. (S.C.M. Press. 1943. 6/-.)

12,000, while in 1943 they were still being arrested for what the Nazis called speaking "disloyally" about the actions and institutions of the State.'

We cannot find that this resistance was directed against policies other than those concerning the authority and teaching of the Church itself. The wider interpretation of the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, particularly in its bearing on Nazi aggressive militarism, has been overlooked:

'The very strength of their conviction comes from their belief that Christianity is not concerned with politics.'

Such an attitude can be a cloak for moral cowardice. It is impossible to foresee what influence post-war Christianity can have on the Pangerman Religion. If there is to be any change in the German God and the German Soul, it can only be expected from something more comprehensive than sectarian ecclesiastical institutionalism, namely, citizenship with Jesus in the eternal Kingdom of God.

W. T. A. PHILPOT.

### BLAISE PASCAL: SCIENTIST, SCEPTIC AND CHRISTIAN

Blaise Pascal is one of France's immortals. He takes his place in the company of Montaigne, Rabelais, Montesquieu, Descartes, Malebranche, Fénelon, Voltaire, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Chateaubriand, Lamennais and Renan—scholars, philosophers, men of letters. Like his company, Pascal is French to the core and so lacks for us the attractiveness of our great English men of letters.

Professor Emile Cailliet, in *The Clue to Pascal*,<sup>1</sup> undertakes to explain him to American and English readers. We have read the book with some care, but do not find that Professor Cailliet tells us anything about Pascal which is not generally known, or that he reveals any psychological secret of Pascal's personality with which we were not already acquainted. He describes, however, with an interesting wealth of detail the environment of Pascal's childhood, youth and early manhood, his extraordinary scientific precocity, his intimate relations with the Port-Royalists, the social circles in which he moved in Paris and Rouen. Pascal's 'home town,' Clermont in central France, the austerity, simplicity and intellectual quality of his domestic environment, his noble father and devout sisters, the religious social and political background of his locality and period are extremely well done.

Where Prof. Cailliet fails to contribute anything of arresting interest is in his diagnosis of the personality of Pascal and in his exposition and valuation of Pascal's writings. This is not surprising. We doubt if anyone could have contributed anything original to the further understanding of Port-Royal with its austere morals and rigid theology, or the demoralizing subtleties of the Probablist casuistry exposed and flagelated with such extraordinary acuteness and exquisite humour in *Les Provinciales*, or the unravelling of the literary problems arising from the *disjecta membra* of *Les Pensées*. The mine has been too well worked to yield any more gold.

Pascal's personality comprised an extraordinarily acute intellect pre-eminent in its mathematical and logical qualities, a very powerful, profound and unflinching moral insight, united to an extremely sensitive religious consciousness. If it be true that '*Le style est l'homme même*' (the style is the very man), then we must add that Pascal possessed a brilliant satirical humour which at once made his *Provinciales* a French classic. Although his personality commands profound respect, it fails in attractiveness and that because it

<sup>1</sup> *The Clue to Pascal*, by Emile Cailliet. (S.C.M. Press. 1944. 6/-.)

lacks richness and warmth. Its keen intellectualism, its moral austerity, its religious subjectivity separate Pascal from all but the elect.

His dependence on God is dominated by fear rather than by love. This accounts for two things in Pascal's religion: his acceptance of Calvinism, or rather Augustinianism in the Jansenist form in which it was affirmed by the heroic community of Port-Royal, and his unquestioning submission to the ecclesiastical authority of the Papacy. Some who have thought of Pascal as half a Protestant because he so fearlessly and trenchantly criticized the Jesuits may be interested to read the following declarations cited by Prof. Caillet:

'First of all, the profession of faith of the seventeenth *Provinciale*: "Thanks be to God, I have no bond on earth but to the Apostolic Roman Catholic Church alone, in which I am determined to live and die, and in communion with the Pope, its sovereign head; outside of which, I am fully persuaded there is no salvation."

In November, 1656, Pascal made a similar profession of faith to M. and to Mlle. de Roannez: "We know all the virtues, martyrdom, austerities, and all good works are useless outside of the Church, and the communion with the head of the Church who is the Pope. I shall never separate myself from his communion, at least I pray God to grant me this grace; without which I should be lost for ever."

It seems to us that the three outstanding aspects of Pascal's personality, the intellectual, the moral and religious, were never really integrated, although he strove to integrate them. Perhaps this failure was due to his ill-health, perhaps to the fact that he died at the age of thirty-nine (1662 A.D.), and so had no chance of developing that ripening unification of personality which advancing years and enlarging experience should contribute. To Pascal, however, we owe the most acute and devastating criticism of ecclesiastical casuistry which has ever been penned, directed primarily against the Probabilism of the Jesuit casuists, but applicable to all methods of moral teaching which would end by depriving the moral consciousness of its absolute authority and relegate the moral principles of Christ to the seldom-visited cupboards of 'counsels of perfection.'

In his *Pensées* (consisting of notes for a Christian apologetic which its author was unable to complete), Pascal on the one hand deprived Materialism of authority for rational beings in a sentence which once read can never be forgotten:

'Though the whole universe of matter should crush a man, the man would yet be superior to the material universe; for he would know that he was crushed: but the material universe would not know that it had crushed him.'

On the other hand Pascal deprived rationalism of its claim to be the sole and supreme guide for human personality. He wrote:

'The soul has reasons of its own which the intellect cannot fathom'—a very dangerous saying should it lead any man to discard reason or to act against it, but of immense value if it permits a spiritual faith which is not opposed to reason (although it transcends it) to inspire and direct our conduct and outlook in this vale of soul-making.

'I do not' (wrote the greatest of the Cambridge Platonists) 'oppose rational to spiritual; for that which is spiritual is most truly rational,' seems to be on a higher level than Pascal attained.

To know, to doubt, to obey, to be a scientist, to be a sceptic, to be a Christian, all in one, was the ideal of Blaise Pascal. He was a scientist in his acceptance of assured results, a sceptic in his rejection of unproved hypo-

theses, a Christian in his obedience to Christ's moral standards and spiritual ideals: but his religious life, due to his morbid fears, lacked triumphant faith in God's irresistible love of Man; for, as the Apostle of Love wrote,

'Perfect love casteth out fear. . . . He that feareth is not made perfect in love.'

The Englishman to whom Pascal seems most akin is Isaac Newton, who delivered to his age and generation, with the one hand, *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia* and, with the other hand, the *Prophecies of Holy Writ*—and it is probable that he esteemed the latter as of greater value than the former.

We cannot help contrasting Pascal with the greatest of nineteenth century French scientists, Louis Pasteur, who made no attempt to reconcile his science with his religion, but retained throughout his life, in two water-tight compartments, the Catholic piety of a devout, uneducated mother and the intellectual liberation and enlightenment of a modern scientist. No doubt Pasteur secured rest for his soul by this method; but by it he contributed nothing to the solution of the religious problems of his age. Pascal not only made his contribution to the science of his age, but he also made a contribution to its moral and religious philosophy: and modern Christians resorting to *Les Pensées* may there find relief, even to-day, from some of their doubts and difficulties.

H.D.A.M.

### RELIGION RECONDITIONED \*

Mr. Wellbye, in his interesting volume *What the Future Demands of Religion*, has drawn people's thoughts towards religion—less to believe, however, than to inquire.

'We have a creed half of which is only half believed in by less than half the population, but, although there has never been less church-going and more unbelief than now, there is a growing feeling that religion—of some sort—is a necessity.

'If God and an after-life are set aside as probably unprovable but anyhow irrelevant to the conduct of this life, and if the miraculous is discarded as incredible and needless, do the elements of a satisfying and sustaining religion exist?'

The problem is to make life seem worth while; otherwise, of course, Western Europeans will go the way of certain South Sea Islanders, and fade out through weakening of the will to live.

Mr. Wellbye sees the universe as a place

'where not only is something always going on, changes always taking place, but what is going on is not just happening over and over again. One change leads up to another, and it is impossible to imagine them happening in any other order. There is a steady opening out into something more complex, more delicate, more sensitive, more subtle.'

Thus a survey of the cosmic process reveals the universe as 'an intensely dynamic thing.' Man is part and parcel of that process, and

'there is something wrong with us, if the dynamic nature of the process does not possess us and impel us zestfully forward to do what it is the unescapable lot of humanity to do.'

Mr. Wellbye holds that man can best co-operate with the cosmic process by developing his personality.

'Here in human nature is recognizable a definite direction of change, a development or opening out of what once had the latency of the germ. There is, clear and unmistakable, through the history of human culture the urge to high personality. . . .

\* *What the Future demands of Religion*, by R. F. Delancey Wellbye. (Watts & Co. 1942. 5/-.)

'Although existence cannot be explained, there does become evident a pattern of the universe and a pattern of human character, both of them patterns for action: forward moving, not fixed. Both movements are along the same line, the human constituting, indeed, a new phase of the cosmic.'

Thus it is man's business to realize that his individual and collective well-being lies in 'conforming our wills to the line of cosmic movement,' and what this means, so far as we are concerned, is that free and rich personality must be developed in abundance.

People are fond of saying that the world cannot be made much better because human nature cannot be altered. But as a matter of fact the self or individual *is* capable of cultivation and development. Much hinges on experiences and the use made of them; and of course people vary in their power to convert their experiences, unpleasant as well as pleasant, into food for the soul.

'An experience is not to be confused with a mere occurrence. Lots of things occur to or around us that do not affect us at all. . . .

'An experience, on the other hand, does leave an impression. Although we seldom realize it, we are never quite the same after an experience. . . . A woman who has borne a baby, a man who has been married, a traveller who has escaped from a bad train smash—all these people are changed by their experiences.'

Especially in youth many people are cheated out of the fruits of their experiences. They are not allowed to figure things out for themselves; but their elders thrust ready-made explanations upon them. Thus one generation spoils the insight and freshness of the next.

This chapter on Human Nature is the best in the book. We feel convinced that what religion needs to-day primarily is a new anthropology. The pessimistic anthropology now fashionable in orthodox and anti-liberal circles is a natural reaction against the over-optimism of the nineteenth century. No doubt Freud and the present lapse into barbarism of a certain section of Europeans have much to answer for. But there is no reason for over-indulgence in *la nostalgie de la boue* which our neo-Calvinists and neo-Scholastics indulge in.

The positive half of Mr. Wellbye's book strikes one as more effective than the critical portion. It contains plenty of good stuff, and is a useful antidote to much of the current denigration of humanity now taking place in the interests of reaction. No doubt evolutionism can lend itself, like traditionalism, to pharisaism. No creed is fool-proof, anyhow. Mr. Wellbye is trying to meet our present difficulties in a spirit of rational hope.

J.C.H.

## RECENT BOOKS ON RELIGION: AN AMERICAN VIEW-POINT

The following are some of the books selected by the Religious Books Committee of the American Library Association (May 1, 1943—May 1, 1944).

Bailey, A. E. *Daily Life in Bible Times*. Scribner, 1943. \$3.00.

Reconstructs imaginatively the life of Bible times in its various epochs. Makes clear, with the help of drawings and photographs, the way men lived, fought, worshiped and created a culture.

Bratton, F. G. *The Legacy of the Liberal Spirit*. Scribner, 1943. \$2.75.

An historical interpretation of liberalism, using the word broadly as a quality of spirit rather than a set of dogmas. Traces the development of modern thought through biographies.

Brown, W. A. *The New Order in the Church*. Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943. \$1.50.

An analysis of the changes needed in the present government and administration of the churches if they are to contribute effectively to reconstruction.

Brunner, Emil. *The Divine-human Encounter*. Westminster, 1943. \$2.50.

A major European theologian clarifies his central conception of revelation, as the result of a personal meeting between the accepting God and the answering man. His most useful book for American readers.

Calkins, Raymond. *The Romance of the Ministry*. Pilgrim Press, 1944. \$2.00.

This mellow account of motives, sustaining faith, guiding methods and objectives of the vocation of the ministry, makes good reading for laymen as well as for ministers.

Craig, C. T. *The Beginning of Christianity*. Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943. \$2.75.

A comprehensive, scholarly account of the emergence of the Christian faith and the genesis of the Church. Clear, forcible and gripping.

Fitch, R. E. *A Certain Blind Man*. Scribner, 1944. \$2.00.

Vigorous essays on the spiritual heritage, condition and destiny of the American people, written with delicious humour by an unsentimental, yet hopeful, religious thinker.

Flewelling, R. T. *The Survival of Western Culture: an Inquiry into the Problem of its Decline and Resurgence*. Harper, 1943. \$3.00.

A rewarding discussion of the underlying 'spiritual and moral readjustment of society,' essential to the achievement of personal freedom and social welfare.

Grant, F. C. *The Earliest Gospel*. Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943. \$2.50.

A study of the evangelical tradition at its point of crystallization in the Gospel of St. Mark; the major questions definitely handled, with constant regard for both religious devotion and scholarly criticism.

Heard, Gerald. *Preface to Prayer*. Harper, 1944. \$2.00.

A book on the reasons for prayer and its techniques, intended for those who have ceased praying and wish to resume it.

Hughes, E. J. *The Church and the Liberal Society*. Princeton, 1944. \$3.00.

A criticism of the powerful force in nineteenth and twentieth century Europe, known as 'liberalism,' by an able and representative Catholic scholar.

Hughes, Philip. *The Popes' New Order*. Macmillan, 1944. \$2.50.

A systematic presentation of the encyclicals of Popes Leo XIII, Benedict XV, Pius XI and Pius XII covering the period from 1878 to 1941.

Jones, R. M. *The Radiant Life*. Macmillan, 1944. \$2.00.

America's leading Quaker persuasively interprets life in terms of its resources of light and power.

Kepler, T. S. *Contemporary Thinking about Jesus*. Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1944. \$3.50

The significance of Jesus to-day, the meaning and relevance of his teaching, his relation to history, and similar questions are discussed in fifty-five selections from contemporary scholars.

Klein, Isaac. *The Ten Commandments in a Changing World*. Block, 1944. \$1.75.

This interesting series of homilies on the Ten Commandments, the work of a fine Talmudic scholar, will be read with interest by people of all faiths.

Knudson, A. C. *The Principles of Christian Ethics*. Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943. \$2.75.

An historical survey and examination of the main problems of human conduct, written from the personal standpoint. A substantial book for serious study.

Laubach, F. C. *The Silent Billion Speak*. Friendship Press, 1943. \$1.00.

A dramatic account of the methods this world-renowned educator has used in teaching illiterate people to read in an incredibly short time.

Moffatt, James. *The Thrill of Tradition*. Macmillan, 1944. \$2.00.

Unusual treatment of Christian tradition, including the first oral tradition, traced through the centuries by a great scholar who writes with charm and grace.

Scott, E. F. *Varieties of New Testament Religion*. Scribner, 1943. \$2.75.

Eight different types of early Christianity are distinguished and their variety emphasized as a continuing source of strength.

Sherrill, L. J. *The Rise of Christian Education*. Macmillan, 1944. \$2.50.

This history of successive Jewish and Christian philosophies and methods of religious education to the time of the European Renaissance breaks fresh ground and makes a most timely appearance.

Yang, Y. C. *China's Religious Heritage*. Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943. \$1.50.

Studies of Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism, and the religious meaning of Chinese culture, and Christianity in China, by a distinguished Chinese educator.

### MODERN EVANGELISM

We are glad that the M.C.U. has issued a series of pastoral booklets.\* They are written for the shepherds to give to their flock, and all the writers seem to have kept the flock well in mind. No. 1, *Some Thoughts for the Bereaved*, by A. G. Coombs, should be a real help to many, especially at this time. It is neither pious nor platitudinous, but a helpful word from an understanding heart. Nos. 2 and 3, *Headlines of Christianity*, by the Bishop of Truro, are short talks or addresses in the form of a letter. They are based on the Catechism, and are very clear but full of meat. No. 4, *Why go to Church?* by Canon Marcus Knight, is a series of cogent and commonsense arguments for public worship. No. 5, *You Hold the Future*, by Frank W. Moyle, is an enlightened and inspiring talk to expectant mothers. No. 6, *Why Baptize Infants?* by Dr. Major, is an excellent tract to give to parents either when they come to arrange for Baptism or after the service. It is clear and definite and contains two simple little prayers in verse. No. 7, *Whom God hath Joined*, by the Editor of this series, W. G. Fallows, is a most useful pamphlet to give to those who come to arrange for the Marriage Service. It is a brief but interesting explanation both of the form and meaning of the service. No. 8, *What about Prayer?* by Dr. Major, would be a quite admirable booklet to put into the hands of the average member of the Forces, male or female. It is lucid, realistic, suggestive and most helpful, whilst being entirely free from the note of a morbid sentimentality. No. 9, *Is Anyone among you Sick?* by A. W. Adams, a hospital chaplain, is a general talk on illness and how to bear it. Like the booklet on Prayer, it is refreshingly free from all traces of a morbid sentimentality and is bracing and stimulating. It will help even those who 'enjoy bad health'!

F.I.L.R.

\* *The Pastoral Series*, a set of nine booklets, edited by the Rev. W. G. Fallows, M.A. 9d. per set from the Hon. Sec., Modern Churchmen's Union, Steeple Claydon Vicarage, Bletchley, Bucks.

## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

## GOD'S FOREKNOWLEDGE AND MAN'S FREE WILL

SIR,

It was a surprise to find this subject discussed without any reference to what is surely the most important factor in the problem—the nature of time. Athenagoras hesitated to use temporal adverbs to qualify divine activity. We, surely, can no longer do so. By speaking of God's *foreknowledge* or *prescience* we are restricting Him to the time series. How can we do this when our greatest modern physicists and mathematicians appear to agree that Time is no transcendent entity, but a factor in the space-time continuum, having no meaning apart from the existence of the physical universe? <sup>1</sup> God is immanent, but He is not contained by His creation. He is not, as we are, inside the continuum and limited by the time series.

Four (or more) Dimensional Consciousness is unimaginable to us, who are within the continuum, but at least we can recognize that it must exist, and use words which harmonise with its existence. For God, to put it Irishly, there never was a time when anything wasn't. We limit Him unnecessarily by our temporal prefixes. God does not foresee. He sees. Can we not conclude that the whole history of creation, in which free-will and moral responsibility are factors, are seen by God as part of his 'unbounded Now'?

N. S. POWER.

## REPLY OF PROFESSOR CLEMENT ROGERS

Mr. Power is of course right. The question of God's foreknowledge and of Man's free-will should be discussed with reference to the problem of the nature of Time. But my article was in the main an historical survey of what people had said from Origen to Martineau, who, with Dugald Stewart and Sir William Hamilton, supported my contention that God's foresight was limited by 'a self-limitation just like His abstinence from causing them (contingent events); lending us a portion of His causation He refrains from covering all with His omniscience,' and that 'There is no absurdity in supposing that the Deity may, for wise purposes, have chosen to open a source of contingency in the voluntary action of His creatures to which no prescience can possibly extend.'

Since then S. Alexander has written his *Space, Time, and Deity*, and has urged us to 'take Time seriously.' When I wrote I had not read Dr. Leonard Hodgson's *Towards a Christian Philosophy*, in which he does what Mr. Power wishes. The chief passage bearing on the question will be found on pp. 105-6, which ends with the words:

'To assert that God knows the contingent or the "mere matter of fact" is in fact to deny that they are what they are, TO DENY THEIR EXISTENCE AS TRULY CONTINGENT OR TRULY "MERE MATTER OF FACT," to argue an idealist position which underestimates the reality of Time. If God's creative activity includes the creation of contingent events, that means the creation of events opaque to His thought; this is one element in the Divine self-limitation involved in His creative activity. God as well as man must "take time seriously."'

But Professor Hodgson's whole chapter vi, 'Freedom, Grace, and Providence,' should be read as well as his chapter x, 'God and Man,' especially p. 173 ff.

CLEMENT F. ROGERS.

<sup>1</sup> *The Nature of the Physical World*, by Sir A. S. Eddington, Chapter IV.

## THE TRAINING OF THE CLERGY

SIR,

As a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union of many years' standing, I have read with much interest your analysis of the Final Report of the Archbishops' Commission, appointed to deal with the recruiting and training of ordinands for the Ministry of the Church.

Having up to the outbreak of the present war spent most of my time in London, which affords to the laity an infinite choice of churches, the experience of living for months on end in one or other small country parish is a new one, and has brought home to me the importance of the proposal that in future all ordinands should receive a thorough training in voice production and public speaking.

But there is another matter of equal or greater urgency. At present, owing no doubt in part to transport difficulties, country congregations are condemned week after week to hear the same point of view—too often one entirely at variance with the 'mental climate' of our time—enunciated from the pulpit, so much so as to invite criticism from unexpected quarters. I have heard such voiced by regular church-goers, middle-aged country folk, not highly educated, but far from unintelligent. They feel that they have been given stones instead of bread. It is much to be hoped that when the war is over some scheme may be inaugurated for a more frequent interchange of pulpits.

That the Final Report refrains from specifying the Philosophy of Religion, or the History and Psychology of Religion, among the educational qualifications required from ordinands is greatly to be regretted. The importance of these studies cannot be overestimated; Plotinus, for instance, whose indirect influence upon the Christian Church is admittedly great, has much—in direct contact—to teach us. Some would go so far as to say that the key to any understanding of Keats' 'Vale of Soul-making' is to be found in the Neo-Platonic writings, and the study of the other World Religions enlarges the spiritual horizon, while the necessity of some knowledge of Psychology in general is being daily forced upon all thinking people.

Among the most pregnant passages in Amiel's journal are the following. Written nearly a century ago, they are at once profoundly Christian in the deeper sense and prophetically in sympathy with the modern outlook.

'The transference of the Christian Religion from the historical sphere to the psychological is the aspiration of our age.

What is called Christianity is an ocean in which a multitude of spiritual currents, originating from various sources, meet and mix—Asiatic and European religions, and above all the great ideas of Greek wisdom, in particular Platonism. . . . Neither their religious doctrines nor their ethics and ideals unite in a single harmonious note. The essential element in them all is that human nature and divine nature can co-exist and unite as a single sublime flame.

Humanity must have a religion. Is not the Christian Religion, taken as a whole, the best of the great living religions? The religion of redemption, of repentance, of reconciliation, of re-birth, of life eternal is not a religion of which we need be ashamed.'

URSULA LOW.

## CORRECTION

In the June *Modern Churchman*, page 27, line 20 from the bottom, read 'causal' for 'casual.'—Ed., M.C.